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Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Introduction
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Comment ID: pslp172/83  Respondent: 8555041 / Adrian Platt  Agent:

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

I refer to your letter of the 7th June, inviting me to put forward comments on the new Local Plan.

After making an extensive visit to the “drop-in” event at East Horsley village Hall, my first and horrified comment is that the wider consultation that I referred to in my November 2014 has not been acted upon. If you refer to that letter, which I understand will be seen by the Government Planning Inspector, you will see that, after the 2013 consultation, I made a very strong point to the then Leader of GBC and the Councillor responsible for that plan that the most **important stakeholders were not being adequate information in order to make their comments.** I am specifically referring to house owners, house occupiers and people on the electoral roll. They agreed that the consultation was not good enough and, as I understand it from the Officers at the drop-in session, no general advice has been given. You may feel that it is not necessary because some may not comment or destroy the document. But that is not the point and, unless some very prompt action is taken to advise ALL households, many people are disenfranchised and the whole plan has no credibility. To illustrate my point we had an intelligent couple who own a house in the Borough and they were not aware of the existence of a new 2017 plan.

As long as the Government Planning Inspector will definitely see all the previous comments that I and others made for the 2014 plan, I will limit my comments.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/209  Respondent: 8563393 / Clive Smee  Agent:

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

**SITE ALLOCATION A39.** In terms of centrality to East Horsley’s shops, medical centre and railway station this is a prime EH site for development. Indeed it is - or could be made -so central that arguably it would be an ideal site for the new primary school that the Horsleys will need if housing is developed on the scale proposed. In that case the Raleigh would be completely inadequate in scale and on far too small a site. The site behind Ockham Road North could be used to build a new much larger primary school right next to the Raleigh's existing grossly under used Playing Field. The over crowded old Raleigh School site could be used for housing.

Any development on this site, whether housing or school, will have to solve the flooding problem. Much of the site is in the flood plain, There is already regular flooding of the western ends of the gardens on Ockham Road North that abut this site and regular severe flooding of Ockham Road North itself near the railway bridge. According to Surrey Councillor John Furrey (Cabinet Member for Highways and Flooding) the problem is that “drainage networks have never been mapped” and “the system is old and owned by many different agencies”. These problems will need to be solved before either a large estate or a school can be built on this site.

One other site problem is the poor sight lines for traffic attempting to leave this field and join Ockham Road North. The local Speed Watch regularly records vehicles traveling north under the railway bridge at speeds in excess of 50
miles an hour. As the one footpath on this part of ORN runs alongside the new site and is much used by children going to the Raleigh and Glenesk schools there will also need to be controls on the traffic coming out of site A39.

As implied by the number of houses proposed (100) this could be a good location for housing aimed at elderly people and those only able to afford “low cost housing”. A development like “Frenchlands Hatch” (on Ockham Road South) would be particularly appropriate..

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

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/265  **Respondent:** 8568673 / Enid Morgan  **Agent:**

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

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

Policy A43

This is green belt. It is not suitable for industrial development, the A247 cannot handle the present traffic load let alone an increase in the number of larger forms of transport. The local infrastructure and services cannot handle another 400 homes, the schools, doctors, and all other services are already overloaded in this area. Please think again as this area is not suitable for this plan

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

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1115  **Respondent:** 8570273 / Fiona Curtis  **Agent:** Fiona Curtis

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

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

Policy A55

I object to the removal of land from Greenbelt for the provision of two traveler pitches on Puttenham Heath Road to 'enable delivery'. The area warrants Greenbelt status and should remain in Greenbelt. Removal is a big step towards the eventual development of permanent accommodation, which would result in loss of the two pitches. I understood that temporary approval for one was given due to the exceptional circumstances put forward by the traveller’s solicitor at the hearing. On this basis there is absolutely no need to remove greenbelt status.

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

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/8330  **Respondent:** 8573793 / Harry Eve  **Agent:**

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

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

Various Sites

1. I object to greenfield development, especially development on countryside that is designated for protection such as Green Belt (before the Council’s proposed changes), or is quality agricultural land, or is making a valuable contribution to biodiversity without any statutory designation. If the housing number had been calculated realistically and brownfield sites allocated for genuinely affordable housing rather than retail or business expansion there would be no need to hand over our countryside and villages to developers. This can be taken as a general objection to greenfield sites.

1. I am concerned about the implications of the Housing and Planning Act 2016 - particularly Section 150 and Planning in Principle. Planning matters such as detailed traffic assessment and sustainability are not being covered by the site selection for the Local Plan and are being left to the planning application stage. Under “Permission in Principle” it seems that these matters will be beyond public scrutiny and comment. Traffic assessments will be carried out by developers with a view to proving acceptability. Scrutiny by local residents is highly valuable in ensuring probity in the planning process.

Even if a site (within the current Green Belt) were subsequently found to be unsustainable it will have been released from the Green Belt, through the Local Plan, for no sound reason.

I have some additional comments on specific sites - mainly local to me and where I have some knowledge of the circumstances.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/502  Respondent: 8579393 / Mr John Sweeting  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction

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

Re: Sites numbered:

A25 – Gosden Hill
A43 and A43a - Land at Burnt Common – known as Garlick's Arch
A35 – Former Wisley Airfield

in the revised draft local plan.

I would like to object to the inclusion of these sites in the draft local plan for the following reasons:

1. The number of houses needed in the Borough was changed between the first and second issues of the draft plan indicating that there is considerable uncertainty in this figure and the basis and method of calculation. In view of the recent EU referendum vote and its impact on future immigration, the number of houses required is likely to reduce further. With smaller house numbers the need for any loss of the Greenbelt should be reassessed as 'special circumstances' necessary for reclassification have not been established.
2. Sites 43 & 43a were introduced at the last minute and there has been insufficient time for consultation before its inclusion in the draft plan.

3. Wisley/Ripley/Send/Burnt Common/Send Marsh is a semi-rural area and development on this large scale will lead to to urbanisation and permanently change the nature of the area. In particular this could provide the starting link in connecting Guildford to the M25.

4. These developments place a disproportionate burden on the north east of the Borough.

5. Traffic will increase significantly and the access and exit roads to and from the A3 are too narrow to cope with the resultant increase in traffic - particularly at peak hours.

6. Other infrastructure.
   Is there adequate power, drainage and sewage provision for industrial development and is there sufficient school, medical and similar provisions for domestic expansion?

7. Light and sound pollution.
   The area enjoys fairly dark skies for its proximity to London. Any additional development will add to the light pollution unless provisions are made to ensure strict control of any additional lighting. Please consult Guildford Astronomical Society.
   It already suffers from noise pollution from the A3. Traffic noise pollution seems inevitable if development proceeds.

   If included in the plan, provision should be made for strict control of noise and light pollution emanating from the site – particularly at nighttime.

8. The sites contain a substantial number of trees many of which are quite mature and must make a significant contribution to the Borough's carbon reduction target. It seems perverse that planning permissions have been refused because of the impact on the individual trees whilst the wholesale destruction of woods seems inevitable if these sites are included.

   If included in the plan preservation orders should be placed on appropriate trees as a minimum requirement.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/8327</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8581089 / Jenny Wicks</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A 37, 38, 39 and 40

I object to these policies. No exceptional circumstances are cited to justify the removal of these sites from the Green Belt. None of these developments is large enough to provide infrastructure to ease the strain on existing facilities such as the primary school, medical facilities and congested narrow rural roads. A small scheme (£1m to include environmental improvements) appears in the Infrastructure Schedule for improvements to roads in the area but there are no details of this small scheme and no details of funding, so its implementation is unlikely.

These policies involve a 35% increase in the number of houses in the characterful village of West Horsley, a quite disproportionate increase which will irretrievably compromise its character.

Both A38 and A39 have areas in flood zone 3, in the case of A39 around one third. A sequential test would suggest that there are more suitable sites in the Borough for development than these.

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

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3  Respondent: 8581729 / Jeffrey Gargan  Agent:  
**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( No ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )  
I object as GBC have not followed the correct process  
Policy A43 and Policy A44 are new proposals which were not included in the Regulation 18 draft and should therefore be subject to another full consultation  
I object that there is no demonstrated need for the additional houses on these sites beyond the 13,860 already planned for the Borough  
I object that there is no need for the 7000 sq m industrial development under Policy A43, given that the latest ELNA shows a reduction of 80% in the required employment floor space compared with the previous draft plan  
I object that no case has been made under Policy P2 to demonstrate exceptional circumstances to justify the removal of Send and these sites under A44 and A44 from the Green Belt  
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?  
Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2472  Respondent: 8599201 / Richard D Jarvis  Agent:  
**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Introduction  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )  
Where is A59?  
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?  
Attached documents:

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )  
Executive Summary  
This set of representations are made on behalf of Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd to Guildford Borough Council’s (GBC) Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites. The representations are made in response to the Council’s decision to exclude Land South of New Pond Road Farncombe (Land Availability Assessment Ref: 2241) as a residential
allocation in the Regulation 19 Proposed Submission Local Plan. The site was previously identified as part of a residential allocation (number 80) within the 2014 Draft Local Plan.

These representations draw upon the findings of a number of technical reports with regard to the Land South of the New Pond Road, Farncombe, and these reports are attached as appendices. These cover landscape and visual impact, flood risk, sustainability, archaeology, ecology, heritage and transport. We conclude that land to the south of New Pond Road, Farncombe:

- Makes limited contribution to the four assessed purposes of Green Belt and to the (defined) special qualities that are intrinsic to designating an AONB;
- Has no technical constraints preventing the site from being used for residential development;
- Can fully deliver housing in the first 5 years of the plan, thus contributing towards Guildford Borough’s five year land supply; and
- Is sustainable as it is well located to existing local facilities and services, including local public transport infrastructure.

GBC’s strategy relies upon a number of strategic sites, and it is acknowledged that the current backlog of housing provision will not be met within the first five years of the plan. This highlights the critical need to allocate smaller and medium sized sites which are capable of delivering housing in the short term.

NLP have critiqued the West Surrey Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). The following matters are identified as being of particular concern:

- A failure under the duty to co-operate to address how the housing needs of the West Surrey Housing Market Area (HMA) will be addressed, in particular, with respect to significant unmet housing needs of Woking (which the SHMA identifies as being 3,150 homes between 2013 and 2027);
- A failure to take account of recent London migration patterns which indicate an additional need of 1,200 dwellings across the HMA;
- Market signals and affordable housing demand both point to the need for a substantive uplift being required to the Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) figure; and

Costly infrastructure requirements (particularly with regard to major road and rail projects) raise doubts about the deliverability of a number of the proposed housing allocations.

The representations also provide a comparison of the New Pond Road site with four similar sites that are proposed housing allocations, and identifies that the New Pond Road site is comparable or preferable in landscape and sustainability terms and should be added to the Local Plan as a residential allocation.

The representations raise concern about the allocation of the land to the south of Normandy and north of Flexford (Policy A46). Key concerns include:

- The site is identified in the Council’s Green Belt and Countryside Study as a highly sensitive land parcel;
- Development would cause considerable harm to the openness of the Green Belt and remove the highly sensitive gap between the two villages; and
- Extensive infrastructure provision will be required, and the deliverability of the site is uncertain.

In summary, the representations raise critical concerns about the soundness of the Local Plan as currently drafted, and accordingly Guildford Borough Council are respectfully urged to reconsider the current draft and reinstate the Land South of New Pond Road, Farncombe (LAA Ref 2241) as a residential allocation.

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

**Attached documents:**
Policy A34 and policy E3 generally

Little recognition of permitted development rights of B1 etc to residential.

Very little assessment in the Plan as to how the likely contribution to housing stock (and the corresponding diminution of employment space) will be achieved by the exercise of permitted development rights and by the wider changes in shopping practice that will see many more retail areas seeking change of use.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7620  **Respondent:** 8605793 / Astenbell Ltd (Nigel Sturgess)  **Agent:** Vail Williams LLP (Jane Terry)

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

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

**Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites June 2016 Land at Hillside Farm and The Vineyard, Tannery Lane, Send**

- Policy S1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- Policy S2 Planning for the Borough Our Spatial Development Strategy
- Policy A1 Homes for All

**Introduction**

We are instructed by Astenbell Ltd to make the following submissions to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites, in respect of two parcels of land in Send that we feel should be safeguarded or allocated as dedicated sites for the Custom and Self Build market in order to satisfy the demand generated for this type of housing in the early stages of the plan.

The first site is known to the council and identified in the GBCS as potential development area B16/A The Vineyard, Tannery Lane, Send and the second site is known to the Council as Hillside Farm, Sandy Lane, Send.

Representations regarding the Tannery Lane site were made to the Head of Planning in the middle of May 2016 but may have been received too late to incorporate into the Proposed Submission Plan.

The recently enacted Housing and Planning Act 2016 places a duty on planning authorities not only to keep a register of interested parties who wish to find plots for custom and self-build but also to ‘give suitable development permission in respect of enough serviced plots of land to meet the demand for self-build and custom housebuilding in the authority’s area arising in each base period’.

We understand that the council’s approach to comply with this requirement is to allocate serviced plots on the four strategic sites as set out in Policies A25, A26, A35 and A46 to satisfy the self-build register. However, we consider there are limitations to this approach in that it doesn’t deliver a wide range of choice as required by the NPPF, and fails to take into account the length of time it is going to take to get the strategic sites to a stage where they can offer plots.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7634  Respondent: 8605793 / Astenbell Ltd (Nigel Sturgess)  Agent: Vail Williams LLP (Jane Terry)

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction

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

Our comments in relation to the two sites sought for specific allocation for Custom and Self-build are set out below.

1. The Vineyard, Tannery Lane, Send

The first site is a 5 acre site in Tannery Lane in Send. This site was dropped from the Reg.18 draft in part due to the council’s change to its spatial strategy and also due to the fact that it sat in a land parcel B16 that was deemed to be highly sensitive. Representations on this site were submitted to the council on the 17th May 2016 for a 60% dedicated Self Build site 40% affordable and whilst this was a late submission, the site is not contained within the discounted list of sites in the LAA so it is assumed that the Council is still considering the submission. In addition to the 40% affordable, the landowners also expect to contribute towards infrastructure reasonably related to the scheme and necessary to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms.

The site is Suitable, Available and Deliverable.

Planning history of the site

The site was first identified in the Greenbelt and Countryside Study (GBCS) as Potential Development Area B16-A in land parcel B16. The GBCS stated that “Land parcel B10 provides opportunities to accommodate development without significantly compromising the purposes of the Greenbelt” and that PDA B16-A is surrounded by defensible boundaries and unconstrained in terms of environmental capacity.

Potential development area B16-A shown bordered in red, proposed greenbelt in setting boundary shown in green:

[IMAGE 1]

A full sustainability appraisal of the site was carried out as part of the GBCS and the site was ranked no 1 in terms of its sustainability of all the proposed village extension sites that made it through to the Reg. 18 Draft Local Plan consulted on in the Summer of 2014. More importantly the site is more sustainably located than any of the village extension sites proposed in the s19 Draft Local Plan as per the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Parcel</th>
<th>PDA</th>
<th>Village extension</th>
<th>Average walking distance to facilities</th>
<th>Sustainability score</th>
<th>Sustainability ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West Horsley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Land West of W Horsley Manor Farm</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Grid Ref</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Land North of W Horsley Waterloo Farm</td>
<td>1818</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Land to the South of W Horsley</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>East Horsley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not identified in GBCS</td>
<td>Land near Horsley Railway Station</td>
<td>1238</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B16</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Land to the South East Tannery Lane</td>
<td>1276</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Land West of Winds ridge Send</td>
<td>1512</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2014 the site was given the reference no. 41 and consulted on as part of the Issues and Options consultation. The site fared well in this: The Parish Councils consultation response was:

“Site 41 is the most sustainably located near to existing shops, schools and public transport. Sites 56, 57 and 58 are not within easy walking distance of shops and schools in either Send or Ripley and would be certain to generate significant traffic movements. Development of these sites would also have a large effect on the visual separation of Send and Sendmarsh along Send Marsh Road – which itself would need significant engineering work to remove the narrowed section of bridge half way along it. Site 59 would seem a sensible development which would provide the opportunity to remove nuisance lorry parking along the old London Road and provide employment opportunities for local people”.

The Councils’ response was: “We are currently considering options across the borough, to find the most suitable location for the development we need over the next 15 years. Land at Send and Send Marsh/Burnt Common are options under consideration. We note your preference for sites 41 and 59.”.

The site however was dropped from the Council’s plans between the Reg. 18 and the Reg. 19 drafts due in part to a greenbelt sensitivity assessment that assessed general land parcels not individual sites. It is worth noting that land parcel B16 is 270 hectares compared to this village infill site of 2.1ha.

Site Facts
• Total area 1ha.
• Potential developable area 1ha with defensible greenbelt boundaries as stated in the Green Belt and Countryside Study.
• Detailed in the SHLAA 2014 as being able to accommodate circa 47 homes
• Poor quality Grade 3 Agricultural land (source Magic Map)
• Flood Zone 1 (source Environment Agency mapping)
• “Very Low” risk of flooding from Surface Water (source Environment Agency mapping)
• The site is in single ownership, with no legal covenants restricting development.
• The site is bordered on three sides by the proposed village settlement boundary of Send and is a natural infill village extension
• The site has good road access to Tannery Lane and will be able to contribute to road infrastructure improvements

- The site is not subject to any statutory or non-statutory landscape designations
- The site is not subject to any statutory or non-statutory nature conservation designations
- The site is not subject to any statutory or non-statutory cultural heritage designations

Comment on the Greenbelt Sensitivity Analysis

The Green Belt and Countryside Sensitivity assessed land parcels as to whether they fulfilled the main purposes of the Green Belt. Land Parcel B16 is shown in the image below bordered in purple. It has an area of 270 hectares and encompasses half of Send, half of Ripley and part of Send Marsh:

[IMAGE 2]

The Vineyard sits in the South West Corner of Land Parcel shown bordered in red and has an area of 2.1Ha which represents less than 1% of the land parcels area.

The green line represents the settlement boundary of Send and the blue Lines represent the proposed development sites at Garlicks Arch Copse and Wisley airfield.

Land Parcel B16 was assessed by the GBCS as below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Parcel</th>
<th>Purpose 1</th>
<th>Purpose 2</th>
<th>Purpose 3</th>
<th>Purpose 4</th>
<th>Number of Purposes Met</th>
<th>Green Belt Sensitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Checks the sprawl from Send, Send</td>
<td>Prevents the settlements of Send, Send</td>
<td>Does not assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment</td>
<td>Preserves the setting and special character of historic towns</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh and Ripley</td>
<td>Marsh and Ripley from merging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above summarizes the assessment of Land Parcel B16 against the four main purposes of the Green Belt. The parcel meets the first three purposes but fails to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. It preserves the setting and special character of the Ripley historic village and conservation.
The Greenbelt and Countryside Study VIII para 12.39 and para 12.41 states: “Land parcels B10 and B16 provide opportunities to accommodate development without significantly compromising the purposes of the Green Belt. However, land parcel B16 scored highly with regards to the Green Belt Purposes Assessment (Score 4). PDAs have been identified to the north and south of Send that would **not effect** the overall land parcel with regards to the Green Belt purposes as follows:

B16-A is surrounded by defensible boundaries with partial visual enclosure including hedgerows following Tannery Lane and open fields to the north and west; tree cover following May’s Grove to the east; and residential gardens on Send Road to the south. B16-A is relatively unconstrained in terms of environmental capacity terms

B16-A scored 9.75 and was ranked 6th according to current sustainability credentials. The estimated residential development capacity of B16-A is 47 dwellings.”

We agree with this assessment and consider that a well designed residential scheme that respects the transition from town to countryside would not compromise the main purposes of the green belt. Furthermore, In view of the sites exceptionally sustainable location, we have carried out a site specific Green Belt assessment to confirm the conclusions of the GBCS that development at PDA B16-A would not affect the overall land parcel with regards to the Green Belt purposes.

The GBCS used the following definitions to consider what criteria was used to assess the land parcels and we propose to use these same definitions to assess the Vineyard site referred to as PDA B16-A:

**Purpose 1 - Restrict Sprawl of Urban Areas**

- One of the Green Belt purposes is to check the sprawl of built-up a Urban sprawl is seen as the creeping advancement of development beyond a clear physical boundary of a settlement. Where the Green Belt is adjacent to a clear physical boundary defined by built form, the landscape performs a role in safeguarding against unrestricted sprawl (scoring 1). In contrast, a land parcel which lies away from built development within the countryside would contribute less to this purpose (scoring 0). (Pegasus GBCS Volume II chapter 7)

- We consider that PDA B16-A is next adjacent to a clear physical boundary defined by built form and by this definition the PDA B16-A does perform a role in safeguarding the Green Belt against unrestricted sprawl therefore scoring 1 against this purpose

**Purpose 2 - Prevent Towns Merging**
• This purpose is concerned with preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another and seeks to avoid coalescence of built for Coalescence can be perceived or actual, and physical or visual. Some areas of land contribute more effectively in maintaining separation than others depending on the local environmental or site conditions, such as topography and tree cover. An open, expansive landscape which contributes towards significant separation between two settlements will contribute less in terms of anti-coalescence (scoring 0) whereas a land parcel which forms a narrow gap between two settlements would have a significant anti-coalescence role (scoring 1).

• We consider that there is significant separation distance between PDA B16-A and the nearest neighbouring town of Send. Whilst Send and Send Marsh have a small separation distance that needs to be protected the location and infill nature of PDA B16-A means it does not actually protrude any further into the strategic gap than currently exists from existing development. (see image below) The site also has tree cover to its North Eastern boundary that restricts any perceived coalescence and there are other tree belts between Send and Send Marsh. The image above shows the relationship of the site to the strategic gap. The village of Ripley is over 2 miles away and therefore it is not felt there is any danger of actual or perceived coalescence between the PDA and Ripley.

In conclusion it is not considered that site PDA B16-A acts decisively in preventing actual or perceived coalescence between Send and Send Marsh and as such scores 0 against this purpose.

Purpose 3 - Safeguarding the Countryside from Encroachment

In order to assess whether land parcels perform this purpose, consideration will be given to the extent to which the countryside within a parcel has already been built upon. If the parcel is strongly influenced by built development or urban influences, it will be assumed that this part of the countryside has already been notably encroached by development, and as a result is no longer able to perform this purpose. If however the parcel remains primarily free of development, possessing predominately unspoilt countryside / or uses defined as appropriate in the Green Belt, then it may be considered that encroachment has not yet occurred and the parcel continues to perform the purpose.

The site, whilst not developed itself, is bordered on three sides by development and consequently has as its backdrop the built form of the village of Send. The site is therefore strongly influenced by built development and urban influences and is therefore already noticeably encroached by development.

Purpose 4 - Preserve Setting and Character of Historic Towns

Conservation areas associated with towns and villages within Guildford Borough are considered significant when assessing land parcels against this purpose. In addition, the potential impact upon the setting and special character of historic elements of Guildford, through cross reference to the Landscape Character Assessment (rural / urban fringe assessment 2007) and the likely impact upon Historic Parks and Gardens and Scheduled Monuments, will also be taken into account when assessing whether a parcel performs this purpose. Where a land parcel is considered to notably contribute to the preservation of such historic settings relating to settlements, it will be assumed to serve the purpose.

The nearest conservation area is in Ripley Village over two miles from the PDA. For this reason we believe development of PDA B16-A would not have any effect on the preservation of the Historic Village of Ripley and scores 0 accordingly.

The result of our site specific Green Belt assessment is shown on the table below:

| PDA Purpose area B16-A assessed against the main purposes of the Green Belt |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PDA | Purpose 1 | Purpose 2 | Purpose 3 | Purpose 4 | Number of | Green Belt Sensitivity |
| To check the unrestricted | To prevent neighbouring towns from | To assist in safeguarding the | To preserve the setting and | of | |

Section page number  13
Page 12 of 124
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sprawling of large built-up areas</th>
<th>merging into one another</th>
<th>countryside from encroachment</th>
<th>special character of historic towns</th>
<th><strong>Purposes</strong></th>
<th><strong>Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does Not prevent the settlements of Send, Send Marsh and Ripley from merging</td>
<td>Does not assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment</td>
<td>Does Not prevent the setting of the Ripley historic village and conservation area</td>
<td>Preserves the setting of the Ripley historic village and conservation area</td>
<td>Does Not</td>
<td>Preserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checks the sprawl from Send, Send Marsh and Ripley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Sensitivity 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Proposal (Concept Plan set out at A)

To offer a dedicated scheme of serviced custom build plots with highway access onto Tannery Lane including connections to mains drainage, gas, water and electricity.

- 60% Self Build plots
- 40% Affordable housing
- Public open Space provision
- Improvements to Green infrastructure
- Additional Parking for the existing Residents of Tannery Lane (to ease existing capacity issues)
- Contribution by developer of local infrastructure costs by way of s106 in lieu of lost CIL from Self Build exemptions

Conclusion

The site is sustainably located on the edge of Send village bordered on three sides by built form. It will not have a significant impact on the openness of the surrounding Green Belt; it can come forward quickly and easily being in single ownership and will make a significant contribution to the Government’s initiative for custom and self build housing.

The site should therefore be allocated or safeguarded for custom and self build housing as set out in the proposal above.

2. Land at Hillside Farm, Sandy Lane, Send

The second site is land at Hillside Farm, Sandy Lane, Send under the same terms set out above for The Vineyard site. This land would make an ideal self-build site being sustainably located on the edge of Send and sitting within land parcel B10 classified as being of low sensitivity. This was not identified as a PDA in the GBCS and it is believed this was due in part to the designation of some adjoining land as a Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI). Recently Guildford BC has confirmed that the SNCI status on adjoining land is to be removed.

The site is Suitable, Available and Deliverable.
Hillside farm shown bordered in red, proposed greenbelt in setting boundary shown in green

Site Characteristics

- Total area 15 Ha. Potential developable area 4.7Ha
- 80% of the land (5.7ha) at Hillside Farm was identified as falling within the “Perceived Village Area” by the GBCS.
- The site is well screened from neighbours to the North and East by woodland and hedgerow and to the South by a ridge which would help minimising the visual impact of any develop
- The site is not subject to any statutory or non-statutory landscape designations
- The site is not subject to any statutory or non-statutory nature conservation designation
- The SNCI status of the land to the North is being delisted as part of the Local Plan revi
- The site is not subject to any statutory or non-statutory cultural heritage designations
- Poor quality Grade 4 Agricultural land (source Magic Map)
- Flood Zone 1 (source Environment Agency mapping)
- “Very Low” risk of flooding from Surface Water (source Environment Agency mapping)

Relevant facts from the Green Belt and Country Side Study (GBCS)

The site is situated in Land Parcel B10, classified in the GBCS as a 2* (Low Sensitivity) land parcel. This is a relatively small land parcel of 77ha with much of it containing the settlement of Send.

The GBCS states: “The parcel B10 provides opportunities to accommodate development without significantly compromising the purposes of the Green Belt”.

The site is in a very sustainable location. Assessed using the methodology in the GBCS the site scores 10.25 which would rank the site as more sustainably located than any other village extension site in the Reg 18 & 19 Draft Local Plan.

Sustainability Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Walking Distance to the nearest:</th>
<th>Metres</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Centre</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Type</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Facility</td>
<td>1349</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Road</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway Station</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational facility</td>
<td>611 av</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Sustainability score: 10.25

Recreational facility:

- Accessible greenspace: 764
- Amenity open space: 290
- Community village hall: 600
- School facility: 792

The Proposal (Appendix B Concept Plan)

To construct a link road between Sandy Lane and Potters Lane including connections to mains drainage, gas, water and electricity to service:

- 60% Self Build plots
- 40% Affordable housing
- 6 Acres of Private Woodland (Currently with no Public Access) handed over to be used for Public Open Space offer blue-green infrastructure improvements
- Additional Parking for the existing Residents of Sandy Lane (to ease existing capacity issues)
- Contribution by developer towards local infrastructure costs by way of s106 in lieu of lost CIL from Self Build exemptions
- Local community benefit from provision of blue-green infrastructure improvements

Conclusion
The site is sustainably located on the edge of Send village bordered on other side by residential development. It will not have a significant impact on the openness of the surrounding Green Belt; it can come forward quickly and easily being in single ownership and will make a significant contribution to the Government’s initiative for custom and self build housing.

The site should therefore be allocated for custom and self build housing as set out in the proposal above.

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

Attached documents: 🗄️ IMAGE 4.jpg (75 KB)
🗄️ IMAGE 1.jpg (60 KB)
🗄️ IMAGE 2.jpg (71 KB)
🗄️ IMAGE 3.jpg (67 KB)

Comment ID: PSLPS16/99  Respondent: 8608865 / WBDRA. (David Bird)  Agent: 

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

Policy A21 - WBDRA supports this unreservedly having campaigned for more than 10 years to have this land returned to Allotment Use.

Policy 19 - WBDRA has concerns about this policy as the proposed development could well impact the access of tenants and vehicles to the adjoining allotment site. WBDRA and its members were in favour of housing on this site until we received concerns about restricting or removing allotment tenants’ main access gate. At present we cannot support development on this site until both pedestrian & vehicular access and associated car parking guarantees have been resolved.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1230  Respondent: 8668865 / S Davies  Agent: 

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

I wish to comment regarding sites A36-A41 in the draft plan.

There are no real 'exceptional circumstances' for building over 500 homes in a small village with the infrastructure of a small village.
Within GBC, as in many parts of the South East, there is a need for affordable housing for younger people, families and downsizers.

If these people were to be the beneficiaries in Horsley, many would accept a modest increasing in house building. However building homes with a nod to affordability, with the criteria set for affordability a % of the average price of a house in the village (high), is not going to meet this need. The houses will be occupied by those priced out of London and the only beneficiaries the housebuilders.

These families will require school places - there are insufficient; parking - there is insufficient; access to transport-insufficient capacity and parking; facilities - the local PO depot is closing at the end of the year; shops - limited with insufficient parking; medical services - stretched. The streets of E&W Horsley are littered with potholes and flood heavily in rain. There is no provision to improve any of these essential services.

A SHMA has been undertaken - but meeting this inflated need would have a catastrophic impact on the Horsleys, current and future residents.

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

Attached documents:

---

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

SITES

I OBJECT TO ALL POLICIES INVOLVING BUILDING IN THE GREEN BELT: • No “exceptional circumstances” shown, numbers excessive and the clearly expressed views of residents in previous consultations ignored.

I OBJECT ESPECIALLY TO 6 POLICIES: A36, A37, A38, A39, A40 & A41: • Amount of new housing far exceeds local need. • Housing density excessive when compared with existing development. • Would transform the Horsleys into a sizable town, something for which no case is made. • No local support. • Collective impact of these 6 sites on a small part of the borough not considered. Should not be treated as isolated, separate sites. • Total amount of new building out of scale with the planned development elsewhere the borough, especially less sensitive urban areas not protected by Green Belt. • Sites unsustainable. Key infrastructure lacking. No adequate provision is made to increase it – e.g. poor wastewater capacity, lack of schools, absence of traffic management plan, flooding. • No account taken of additional impact of Wisley Airfield site on Horsleys. • Extension of settlement boundaries too permissive. Horsleys characterised by streets with development along only one side of the road. Policies allow too many adjacent green fields to be developed by squaring off boundaries and claiming they don’t contribute to Green Belt “openness”.

• Green Belt gap with neighbouring settlements hugely narrowed, especially if Wisley Airfield is built on. • Will harm compliance with NPPF 81 – e.g. by making cycling (including Prudential cycle races) too dangerous, ruining the rural setting of Waterloo Farm campsite, destroying the ambience of Grange Park Opera’s new “Theatre in the Woods”. • Policy A40 especially unviable because of high water table and poor drainage, leading to regular winter flooding. • Safe access and egress at Site A40 unachievable, owing to flooding, high speed limits, poor sight lines, narrow access to existing properties, inadequate pavements for elderly and schoolchildren, increasing use by recreational cyclists etc.
I OBJECT to all strategic sites proposed in the draft Plan to be built in the Green Belt.

1. I object to the identification and allocation of sites in this plan without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other constraints. The plan says that “allocating these sites does not grant planning permission for development.” However, each of the sites will be removed from the Green Belt and will be available in principle for development and non-Green Belt uses. The inclusion of these sites without detailed site by site justification shows contempt for the thousands of detailed comments the Council have received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. The plan has hardly changed since the Council received 20,000 objections to its first draft plan in 2014. The Inspector considering the plan may conclude that the consultation has not been properly conducted.

2. The housing needs assessment is flawed in various respects and overstates housing need. In addition since it was produced, the referendum Brexit decision has almost certainly reduced future housing need and rendered the previous assessment seriously out of date. As a result any assessment of Green Belt sites which took place to consider whether “exceptional circumstances” existed to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt was based on false premises and should be reconsidered.

3. Having determined housing need the Council was entitled to consider constraints before determining the housing number. I believe that as Ill as being entitled to do this the Council was required to give proper consideration to constraints. The scarcity of sites outside the Green Belt as Ill as infrastructure (most notable roads) considerations all represented constraints which should have been taken into account in determining the final housing number. Accordingly in this regard our objection to the allocation of Green Belt sites is twofold. First I believe constraints should have been applied. Secondly I believe the Council did not properly consider constraints and that their decision making process was flawed and thus subject to being set aside by the Inspector.

4. Even if having properly applied constraints there is a need to develop in the Green Belt then specific Green Belt sites should not be included in the plan unless “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven in relation to that specific site, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established. There needs to be a specific balancing exercise conducted on each Green Belt site weighing the harm to the Green Belt against the very special circumstances which are argued in favour of development at that particular site. There is no evidence this has been done. Instead the council have appeared to say that having chosen a housing needs figure and decided it cannot be met without building on Green Belt then there is no need for any further consideration and any convenient Green Belt site can be allocated for building at will.

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

Attached documents:
I do not believe that the inclusion of development sites within the green belt, without providing any exceptional circumstances to justify adjustment to the green belt boundary, is either sound or legally compliant. An exceptional circumstance is rare, and it is highly unlikely that there are rare circumstances to create several large-scale developments in Guildford borough's green belt.

I have emailed a separate submission relating to Blackwell Farm (site allocation A26 - which I have looked at in detail). I strongly object to the inclusion of this site in the Local Plan.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2606  **Respondent:**  8729313 / Lisa Wright  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Introduction

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

Overall, I object to this local plan as it;

Does not make efficient use of Guildfords Brownfield sites for homes.

Relies on housing need projection which has not been publically scrutinised.

It is too reliant on Greenbelt to provide housing where no special circumstances have been listed to warrant changing Greenbelt boundaries, especially ignoring residents and elected councillors wishes to protect these areas.

It does not protect our Greenbelt, AGLV and AONB from development.

It makes no attempt to protect our wildlife.

It has no social/council housing provision.

It predominantly adds to traffic congestion, flooding, air pollution and the subsequent physical and mental health issues of our communities.

It takes no account of Brexit and the likely impact of migration or population change.

It does not account for our very large native and foreign student population which should be housed by the University of Surrey to free up our family housing stock.

It adds to the travel congestion from trains, buses and traffic that we have in Guildford with no solution available.

It does not specify what affordable housing is and makes no attempt to provide enough affordable housing for our young people, elderly or key workers.

Most of my comments on previous consultations have been largely ignored and unresolved.

Some of the sites which are still included in this plan have already been refused planning permission.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/300</th>
<th>Respondent: 8755393 / Peter Borer</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site A28 (Land to east of White Lane, Ash Green) should be removed from the Local Plan since it violates the policy of maintaining a separation between the Ash urban area and Ash Green village. The geographic feature of the disused railway line forms a natural southern boundary for the Ash urban area and urban sprawl should not be allowed south of this line.

If a major development is allowed at this site, the separation is reduced to a couple of hundred metres, encouraging coalescing between the urban area and the village.

The access onto White Lane is also problematic, due to the proximity of the bridge over the disused railway line with its hump back zig-zag construction restricting sight lines for oncoming traffic. It is unlikely that an access could be constructed that would meet the Surrey County Council's Highways Department's requirements for 65 metres clear sight lines at 2 metres in from the kerb.

Also the trees forming the boundary between the proposed site and White Lane form part of the Ancient Woodland and they are all covered by a blanket TPO. Obtaining permission to clear these trees, which are part of the Green Belt, would be difficult.

The site should be included in the new area of Green Belt surrounding Ash Green village and should be used as open space (SANG) for the residents of the 1,200 homes proposed for site A29 to the north of the disused railway line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/301</th>
<th>Respondent: 8755393 / Peter Borer</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site A30 Ash railway new bridge scheme.

The section of Foreman Road between Grange Road and the railway station is narrow and has no footpath. It is extremely dangerous for the residents of Ash Green (and the new residents of homes to be build on site A29) to walk from their homes to the station.

The opportunity should be taken to use the new bridge scheme to construct a footpath along this section of Foreman Road. The site plan should extend southwards to the junction with Grange Road, to allow for this as part of the scheme. The cost should be covered by the developers of site A29.
I wish to comment on the Guildford Local Plan. My main "objections" are to the proposed developments at site allocation A26 Blackwell Farm and site allocation A35 the former Wisley Airfield.

Blackwell Farm is sited off the Hogs Back and the proposed development would totally ruin the scenery/views from the Hogs Back. The area is a green space for horse riders and ramblers and a "breathing space". A development of this size would create huge traffic problems. It would totally spoil the character of Guildford.

Likewise Wisley Airfield is situated in an area where the proposed development would create traffic problems. The existing surrounding roads are too narrow for increased traffic and large vehicles eg buses, causing difficulties in getting to local railway stations. Wisley Common, next to the airfield, is a site of scientific interest.

There is already enough concreting over the south east of England without any more. There could be further problems with flooding. The M25 and A3 are often congested and more traffic joining them will not help matters.

We need green spaces for peace of mind! I am also against taking land out of the green belt. The green belt was put in place to prevent urban sprawl and we should think of future generations. Once it is gone, it is gone!

I have kept my objections brief but feel that I have to comment on such an important issue. I accept that some additional housing is needed but not in the numbers these two sites are proposed. I have commented on these sites as I know them both well.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
consider whether “exceptional circumstances” existed to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt was based on false
premises and should be reconsidered.
3. Having determined housing need the Council was entitled to consider constraints before determining the housing
number. I believe that as Ill as being entitled to do this the Council was required to give proper consideration to
constraints. The scarcity of sites outside the Green Belt as Ill as infrastructure (most notable roads)
considerations all represented constraints which should have been taken into account in determining the final
housing number. Accordingly in this regard our objection to the allocation of Green Belt sites is twofold. First I
believe constraints should have been applied. Secondly I believe the Council did not properly consider
constraints and that their decision making process was flawed and thus subject to being set aside by the
Inspector.

Even if having properly applied constraints there is a need to develop in the Green Belt then specific Green Belt sites
should not be included in the plan unless “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven in relation to that
specific site, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as
perceived housing need, as case law has established. There needs to be a specific balancing exercise conducted on each
Green Belt site weighing the harm to the Green Belt against the very special circumstances which are argued in favour of
development at that particular site. There is no evidence this has been done. Instead the council have appeared to say that
having chosen a housing needs figure and decided it cannot be met without building on Green Belt then there is no need
for any further consideration and any convenient Green Belt site can be allocated for building at will.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1139  Respondent: 8803169 / Paul Baxter  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction

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

Dear Sir or Madam

As a long term resident of West Clandon, I must register my very grave concerns with regard to the unacceptable and
highly detrimental impact which this plan will have on our small village. I have registered concerns before, and I am
upset that, once again, the Council seems determined to press ahead with changes which will damage our local
environment for ever.

West Clandon is a village and I, like all residents, want to see that status preserved physically as well as through bodies
like the parish council. As such, whilst I do not object to small scale residential building on infill sites etc, I object very
strongly to what is proposed at Gosden Hill Farm which will erode the tract of countryside between West Clandon and
Guildford. I do not find this acceptable at all - in no time at all West Clandon will have gone the same way as Burpham
and Merrow.

Quite apart from the impact on the village atmosphere we currently enjoy, I am also deeply worried about the impact of
the proposals on our local infrastructure. Traffic through West Clandon on the A247 is already significant; this road,
de spite its 'A' status, is only small, and yet we have high volumes speeding through at all times of day. It cannot be
acceptable to be proposing plans which will add to this problem.

For this reason, as well as objecting to Gosden Hill, I must express dismay at plans to build a major junction north of the
village centre at the A3 / A247 interchange. This, along with extra housing, will place an intolerable burden on West
Clandon and the already overstretched local infrastructure.
I ask the Council to reflect on these points; if sustainability really does matter then please let's see a plan that respects the concerns of local residents and council tax payers and not ride roughshod over them. The current proposals diminish West Clandon in many different ways and, as such, are wholly unacceptable to me and many others.

Yours faithfully

Paul Baxter

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/123  Respondent: 8811233 / Sally Carpenter  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction

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

I have sever concerns about the proposals for over 500 new home in Horsley.

In particular sites A36 A37 and A39

which will all bring extra traffic directly onto Ockham Road South /North which is already too busy and too narrow for existing traffic flows and will also be exacerbated by all the other proposed extra house building in the nearby areas eg Wisley airfield .

The station car park is often full already and has no spare capacity.

The Medical centre and schools are already under pressure and I think it is entirely inappropriate to increase the local population

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2190  Respondent: 8820417 / Simon Marshall  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Introduction

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
No consideration has been made in the revised proposals for the principle enshrined within the NPPF that exceptional circumstances must be demonstrated in order to develop within the Greenbelt. The proposal to inset the village of East Horsley has not been justified by exceptional circumstances. No account appears to have been made in the revised plan to the overwhelming body of public opinion that objects to the development of the greenbelt and which advocates the development of brownfield sites as priority.

I object to the development of new accommodation on the Greenbelt and to the proposal to inset the village of East Horsley and others.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/153  Respondent: 8824833 / Stephen Stuart-Matthews  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction

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

Plan (A36) to convert the Thatchers Hotel on the Guildford Road in East Horsley to 48 Residential Houses

This part of the plan is not sound. It is based on flawed evidence which fails to recognise that the volumes in visitors to RHS Wisley are set to double from 2011 to 2021. (1.1 million increasing to 2.2 million. The evidence used presents no relevant visitor data after 2011. The current growth at Wisley is highly relevant as its annual visitor numbers exceed the combined total of all other Guildford attractions listed in the evidence.

In this part of the plan there is no evidence of recent adequate collaboration with RHS Wisley or the National Trust. Visitor numbers to Polesdon Lacey are rapidly increasing (10% growth from 2013/14 to 2014/15). There is also no evidence of collaboration with Mole Valley (where for instance Polesdon Lacey is located) to discuss impact and mitigation of the reduction in availability of hotel bedrooms.

I object to the Thatchers Hotel site being converted to housing. The site should be retained for hotel and leisure use for the wider economic benefit of the area and to provide future accommodation for business and leisure visitors.

Prior Key Evidence (including The Surrey Hotel Futures Summary 2015) and simple online research clearly shows pressure is increasing for more hotel rooms in the vicinity of Guildford. This is particularly important to the North to accommodate the growing number of visitors to Wisley.

The proposal A36 to convert the Thatchers Hotel in Horsley to residential housing runs completely contrary to the growing need for additional hotel accommodation in the Guildford area. Closing the Thatchers hotel removes 87 rooms from the market representing a 30% cut in the number of rooms available in the Borough outside Guildford centre. This is clearly ludicrous when the number of visitors to North Guildford (Wisley) is set to double (i.e. increase by over 1 million visits) during this decade to 2020.

If the current hotel owners do not find the Thatchers hotel to be profitable enough they should be encouraged to improve or sell to a more suitable hotel or leisure facility operator and not be allowed to convert the site to residential use. Whilst I certainly recognise and accept the need for some additional affordable property in Horsley I believe that replacing a hotel with a housing development is short sighted and not to the long term overall benefit of Guildford Borough or Surrey.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7703  Respondent: 8825057 / Merrow Residents' Association (Keith Meldrum)  Agent:
Merrow

Merrow Ward is centred on the old village of Merrow, on the north-east border of Guildford Town. It is bounded to the north by the Guildford to Effingham Junction railway line, to the east by the National Trust estate of Clandon Park and the southern edge provides entry into the North Downs. A substantial area of Merrow in the south-east is comprised of two golf courses; Guildford Golf Club, the oldest golf club in Surrey, and Clandon Golf.

The main route between Guildford Town and Leatherhead (A246, Epsom Road), passes directly through Merrow and links to the A25 to Dorking via a tight, narrow bend between St John’s Church and the Horse and Groom Inn. These roads become seriously congested at peak commuting times. A Park & Ride facility has been provided on the Epsom Road, just to the east of the developed region of Merrow; this provides some alleviation of Town Centre traffic and congestion but does not help reduce traffic bound for Merrow itself, much of which is associated with local schools.

Merrow has a population of approximately 8000 in 3300 households within an area of 440 hectares. There is a mix of housing types including terraces and purpose-built flats but a predominance of detached properties. Over seventy percent of households own their accommodation either outright or with a mortgage. A council-owned estate was built in the 1950s (Bushy Hill) but since the 1980s many of these properties have passed into private ownership; social rented housing in the Ward now amounts to around 450 households. A further large estate (Merrow Park) of several hundred houses and flats was constructed in the mid-1980s between the Bushy Hill estate and Clandon Park. While much of Merrow fits well with the affluent majority of Guildford borough in the least deprived quartile in England, there is nevertheless an area within Merrow that qualifies as one of the 66 most deprived areas in Surrey.

There is a frequent bus service linking Merrow to Guildford Town Centre and out towards Leatherhead, some of the services looping around the two largest housing estates. The nearest rail station is just within walking distance of the western edge of Merrow but most residents would require transport - bicycle, bus or motorcar - to reach a station.

Merrow is served by three small retail centres: two of them are in close proximity to Merrow schools and one of these two lies opposite a doctor’s surgery, leading to serious parking and traffic congestion problems during term-time. The third and largest retail centre lies on the main Epsom Road and includes a petrol station with grocery outlet, and two restaurants. There is a performing arts school and a collection of small industrial units behind the shops plus an 80-lot allotment garden nearby. Parking availability for this concentration of activity is inadequate and this regularly leads to congestion and dangerous parking practices.

There are five schools located within Merrow, one being a large secondary Catholic faith school with 1250 pupils (St Peter’s), shortly to expand by more than 100, another being a primary Catholic faith school, and there is a large comprehensive school of nearly 2000 pupils just over the Ward boundary in Burpham. Many pupils travel a considerable distance to these and other local schools by car or school-bus which causes serious congestion from both moving and parked vehicles during term-time. This problem has been exacerbated over the past decade by significant expansions of the schools without commensurate improvement to the road network or parking areas.

There is a small business park at the northeast corner of Merrow, comprising a mix of trade, light industrial and some office units. Adjacent to Merrow Business Park is a Surrey County Council depot, accommodating approximately 200 staff. Access to these sites is far from ideal, being located adjacent to a sharp bend in the road and a very narrow railway bridge.

The Merrow Residents’ Association has been in existence for over 40 years and continues to provide a focus for Merrow on environmental, planning, historical and local issues and has an active membership of over 600 people. It is served by a voluntary committee that acts in an apolitical manner to ensure that Merrow retains its present unspoilt and attractive appearance.
The Merrow Residents’ Association is an active member of the Guildford Residents Associations and wishes to be associated with its response to this consultation.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7704  Respondent: 8825057 / Merrow Residents' Association (Keith Meldrum)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction

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

Summary Comments and Objections

The Merrow Residents’ Association is disappointed that so little time has been allowed for responses to this consultation not least because totally new and incomplete documents on transport infrastructure were released at the same time as the 6 week consultation period commenced.

• Chapter 3-we object to this chapter as it is unsound since it contains no town centre masterplan and because too much space has been allocated for retail use that could be used for housing.

• Policy S1- we object to this policy as it is unsound as it does not reflect the requirements of the NPPF.

• Policy S2- we object to this policy as it is unsound as the G L Hearn OAN is too high and should be set at no more than 510 new homes per year in accordance with the advice of NMSS.

• Policy S2- we object to this policy as it is unsound as the housing target has been inflated; the housing target should be corrected.

• Policy S2- we object to the policy as it is unsound as it does not follow the NPPF, the PPG nor the advice of Ministers in the DCLG on constraints.

• Policy H1- the University of Surrey should be required to provide accommodation for more than 60% of their eligible students.

• Policy H2- the policy should require that a proportion of smaller houses should be built as well as smaller apartments.

• Policy P1- we have made some drafting suggestions in the AONB policy wording.

• Policy P2- the policy is unsound as it does not follow the NPPF or the advice from DCLG Ministers.

• Policy P5- the policy will have to be reviewed as a result of the UK’s decision to leave the EU.

• Policy E9- we support this policy on the Local Centre in Epsom Road, Merrow.

• Policy I 1- we object to this policy since the additional traffic generated by the proposed developments would increase traffic congestion.

• Policy I 3- we object to the proposed development of the Sustainable Movement Corridor as it is neither cost effective and nor is it realistic to expect the corridor to deliver the benefits described.

• Policy I 4- we have made some drafting comments but support the drift of this policy.
• Policy A25- we object to this policy as it is unsound as it is not positively prepared.

• Policies A43- we object to the inclusion of policy A43 in the Local Plan as the site is at high flood risk.

• Policy A43A- we object to this policy on the basis that there must be a four way junction north of Potters Lane at Gosden Hill Farm and therefore there is no need for slip roads onto the A3 at Garlick’s Arch.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/750  Respondent: 8825697 / Online imaging (Peter Gelardi)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction

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

No justification is provided for the inflated SHMA figures.

With regard to A35 and A43 no information is provided with regard to how infrastructure will be upgraded to mitigate the adverse effect on the 10,000 people who live in the north east of the borough.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/425  Respondent: 8829921 / Peter Gray  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction

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

National Green Belt Policy says in section:

* 2.6 It also states that villages should only be included in the Green Belt if the open character of the villages makes an important contribution to the openness of the Green Belt (paragraph 86). ?

* The Horsley's should NOT. be removed from the green belt because they DO make an important contribution to the openness of the green belt and clearly is of open character. As far as I can gauge your voluminous planning documents are full of subjective judgements, not the least of which in relation to the Horsley's. Note the positioning of St. Mary’s church (12th. Century historically important building ) and West Horsley Place, both still in the green belt and not included in your arbitrarily drawn village boundaries. In my opinion anyone viewing the Horsley's from a helicopter above the church would be hard pressed to prove that they do not make an important contribution to the green belt and open character.

* So I object to the removing of the Horsley's from the green belt on the basis of a judgement error made by your planners.

* I have some sympathy to the need for more housing but have the opinion ( as your planning objectives also do) the the
provision of these should NOT detrimentally change the character of the existing village. Many of the village population, many elderly inhabitants have lived there precisely because of its beauty and green openness and relatively rural nature. Dealing specifically with the three development sites in West Horsley north of the railway line, the plan is looking for the provision of more than triple the number of existing homes in that area. The density should be no more than the density of the existing area OR the character of the existing area is detrimentally changed. Big time!
*I object to the number of homes planned in these three developmental areas on the basis the village character will be detrimentally affected and disturb the wellbeing of the inhabitants.

*I also object to the density of the housing proposal on the basis that, if developed, the increase in population will overburden an already struggling road infrastructure and service providers like schools, medical centre and halls.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1130  
**Respondent:** 8833857 / Gail Cook  
**Agent:**

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

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

I object to the inclusion of site A26 Blackwell Farm and A46 Normandy. Blackwell Farm is an important greenbelt area which should not be used for housing or expansion of the Surrey Research Park. Land in Normandy is a huge development for the village, which does not justify a new secondary school. Both these developments will have a massive impact on local infrastructure, particularly traffic congestion.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7242  
**Respondent:** 8839041 / Jon Maslin  
**Agent:**

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

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

I object to ALL Green Belt sites allocated for development in the local plan.

I object to the identification and allocation of sites in this plan without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other constraints. The plan says that ‘allocating these sites does not grant planning permission for development, however, it does identify the principle of development and uses.’ This ignores the tens of thousands of detailed comments the Council have received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. This amounts to a war of attrition by the Council in conjunction with developers, since many busy residents are tired of repeating the same comments as it appears to be a waste of time and effort. The plan has hardly changed since the Council received 20,000 objections to its first draft plan in 2014.13

All Green Belt sites should be removed from the plan until ‘exceptional circumstances’ for development are proven, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established.

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

Due to the reasons stated above,

I OBJECT to the inclusion of site A25.
I OBJECT to the inclusion of site A26.
I OBJECT to the inclusion of site A35.
I OBJECT to the inclusion of site A43.
I OBJECT to the inclusion of site A43a.
I OBJECT to the inclusion of site A46.

I would like my comments to be seen by the Inspector.

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

Attached documents:

The Localism Act 2011 has not been complied with in that no assessment has been put forward for housing provision in Bordon East Hampshire to meet housing need in Guildford despite the existing clear interaction of the areas and the lack of planning constraints in terms of Green Belt, AONB AGLV and National Park at Bordon.

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

The amendments proposed fail
A to use brownfield sites to a maximum.
B to accept that a defined Green Belt boundary once established should be for a substantial period which Policy P2 as amended fails to achieve.
C to take note of the University of Surrey’s failure to honour it’s undertaking to the Inquiry into the current Local Plan over the Green Belt and local amenity despite the importance stated to be recognised in the Spatial Vision of access to rural areas.
D to resist the intrusion on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty which is to be overruled despite objection from the Management Board. This is also contrary to the increased prominence given to the future of the Area of Great Landscape
Value in the amendments to Policy P1. The AONB wraps over onto the northern slopes of the Hogs Back and its at present countryside views will be urbanised along the greater part of the Hogs Back.

E to understand the highway aspects of accessing the site which have been addressed in a simplistic way and underestimate the highway and environmental damage and fail to comply with the proposals as amended in ID1 and ID2. In particular 4.6.18 makes it clear there is a high level of contingency and any development on this section of the A3/A13 must be contingent on those works being completed before development and as that cannot be assured the site should be omitted from the current Local Plan. The University mislead the Council in relation to the current 2003 Local Plan on traffic and the simplistic junction on the A31 proposed cannot work without substantial A31 and A3 junction improvements

Expanding on A and B above.

A to use brownfield sites to a maximum. The Borough fails to face the key decisions essential to site Allocation which meets National Planning Policy.

Guildford has failed to target its brownfield sites or to take advantage of the Localism Act 2011 and the requirement to look at out of District development. The current proposals retreat still further from giving priority to brownfield utilisation.

Specific examples are

i. previous discussions of building over car parks have been scaled down. For example, residential redevelopment of A12 Bright Hill car park where the target is lowered from a target of 60 units to 40. It is a sustainable location with easy pedestrian access to the town centre. Car parking needs to be retained and the chalk substructure means this can be underground. Surrounding buildings and topography mean that sustainable buildings up to 4 storeys can be designed in.

The University must address building over its many car parks including those at Manor Farm. Likewise, the Borough Council has valuable sites such as along the River Wey where good architecture could provide sustainable housing, improved aesthetics and still allow the car parks to remain as a necessity for the town centre. To take this on board vigorously would materially ameliorate the need to destroy Green Belt.

The new headquarters for the World Wildlife Farm Living Planet Centre at Rufford House, Woking GU21 4LL over the Brewery Road car park shows building over car parks can enhance the location even alongside an important urban waterside site.

ii. The Localism Act 2011 requires cross boundary co-operation but Guildford has shown limited horizons and regarded this as a formality to pursue with minimum purpose. For example, co-operation with East Hampshire Council, many of whose residents work in Guildford and whose transport links to Guildford could provide an excellent residential environment at Bordon.

Development at Bordon in East Hampshire is taking place on land that is neither Green Belt, Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty nor in the South Downs National Park and further land outside those protected categories is available. If this is further expanded a key aspiration of Bordon’s status as an eco-town, the re-instatement of the rail link to the town, could be funded. That link would connect to Guildford and serve the University via the new Park Barn Halt to the direct advantage of Guildford and University while enhancing the sustainability of the Bordon eco-town and preserving Guildford Green Belt. The rail connection would ameliorate the traffic congestion between on the road connections between Guildford and Bordon.

iii. The Council @ A7 is accepting an unacceptably low utilisation of brownfield sites at Guildford Station. Development is proposed only alongside the railway lines creating a poor environment and minimisation of the housing to be created with maximum ascetic degradation.

What is clearly needed is an imaginative architect led design over the whole of the station area and the rail lines leading to it plus the Guildford Park public car park and running down to Walnut Tree Close. This would be at the forefront of sustainability and could provide a car free living area with all the facilities residents would require. Network Rail lacks the imagination to take this forward so the Borough should push this. It is a publicly owned and pressure should be applied if they do not co-operate via Guildford’s MP would work with the Borough to ensure the matter came to the attention of the Secretary of State to ensure maximum use of brownfield sites. The Localism Act 2011
made it clear public bodies must co-operate in achieving its aims.

B to accept that a defined Green Belt boundary once established should be for a substantial period which Policy P2 as amended fails to achieve.

The 1993 Borough Plan set a clear boundary excluding major parts of Manor Farm from the Guildford Urban Area with the Green Belt extending to the University slip road from the northbound A3. At the behest of the University the 2003 Local Plan reviewed that boundary and allowed the removal of a material part of Manor Farm for University specific purposes.

Paragraphs 83 and 84 of the NPPF reflect previous policy guidance. They are the current central policy which must be followed. Specifically Paragraph 83 states once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. Authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period.

In the case of the land proposed for development to allow another reconsideration after 2 Local Plans have carefully set the boundary and then varied it for a specific reason to support the University to vary again makes nonsense of the planning policy enshrined in the NPPF. Paragraph 84 provides:

“When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development?”.

To prefer out of town green belt to brownfield and other options cannot be sustainable.

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1231  Respondent: 8857313 / Paul Morris  Agent:

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

I would like to object to point A46. I feel that this proposal is not sustainable for the area it is proposed, for instance the additional pressure on local roads would change the face of this semi rural location radically, potentially against the wishes of the local populace.

It would seem that there is a danger of never taking on the root causes of the problems of Guildford, predicting housing need and building accordingly just becomes self fulfilling. With this mentality we will never reach "enough”. This approach is clearly not sustainable, indeed it is cavalier and rash.

The plan does not take into account the value of our rural heritage across the borough. It should be valued far more than as a resource to be exploited as a very short term fix. It is one of our most precious asset, without it we will be on our way to being just another Croydon or Woking.

Apparently only exceptional circumstances can justify the changing of the Green Belt boundaries of Normandy and Flexford. I haven't hear what these are but I would expect it would be more than GBE being unable to find sufficient school places or in the case of Blackwell Farm just to help out the university in its desire to expand.

To summarise, I feel that were the plan to go ahead the consequences for the future of Guildford and it villages would be much worse than any advantage to be temporarily gained. We would lose more than we'd gain, what we lose would be gone for ever what we gain would be gone in a fleeting moment.

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

Sites

1. Green Belt sites

I object. The policy identifies the principle of development and identifies sites within the Green Belt which is against the will of the people who live there and ignores the 20,000 objections to the previous consultation. It has no regard for infrastructure and other constraints and doesn't make use of brownfield sites in urban areas that are alternatives. The Green Belt should be retained in its entirety and short term housing goals shouldn't allow planners to be able to override the long term future of the Green Belt for future generations.

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

I object to the pro growth agenda of the Local Plan sites.

If the housing number in the SHMA was corrected following all the mistakes highlighted by GGG and the public, then there would be no need for building on the greenbelt and I would be much more likely to support the Local Plan. The plan should also require the University of Surrey to build the accommodation it has promised for existing students and ensure that all additional students are housed on campus.

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

As a resident of East Horsley I am greatly concerned about the extent of the proposed development in the village (and apparent proposed widening of the boundaries of it and removal of the land from the Greenbelt) particularly when the planned development of the Wisley airfield is taken into account.
There appears to be a shortage of housing in the Guildford area and the Horsleys must bear some of the burden to remedy that. However, the addition of circa 533 new houses appears obviously unsustainable if the current nature of the village is to be maintained. That is, Horsley is to remain a pleasant, community-spirited environment in a rural location.

Adding over 500 new homes will inevitably destroy much of what people moved to the village to enjoy. Perhaps more importantly though, the current services and amenities in the village - roads, schools, medical facilities etc - simply couldn't cope.

Has anyone involved in the proposed plan actually spent any time in the village centre at weekends? The centre is already almost comically busy at times and the addition of several thousand additional people will create real traffic and safety issues. As for the roads, I hardly need to comment on the risk that material additional local traffic will have. Have the authors driven along The Drift recently? It is horrific and getting worse and additional traffic can only have a detrimental effect. Similarly, has anyone involved tried to get a prompt appointment at the medical centre recently? With all those additional people the health service provided to villagers will plainly take a further dive.

As things stand the revisions to the Local Plan do not take account of the practical impact that the proposals will have on the community. Add to that the knock-on effect of up to 2000 homes at Wisley and the Council faces destroying the way of life of much of the current community. What is particularly bizarre is that the evidence supplied doesn't appear to justify a need for anything like the number of new homes being proposed.

More homes in Horsley? Yes, of course. The number being suggested? Absolutely not.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5900  Respondent: 8878689 / E McShee  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As above I strongly object to this use of working farmland.

This land has had a total of 1266 homes allocated against it – is this not predetermination? At the time of writing this objection this site has not been before the Planning Committee or decided. This application has been with the Planning Department for 3 years and is still not decided.

The largest number of homes allocated to this site are in Ash/Tongham – which is a few miles from this site – people are hardly likely to travel that distance just to walk their dog or use it for recreation.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1095  Respondent: 8880737 / Sue Russell  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I am particularly concerned about the proposed development of land north of Keens Lane. The transport infrastructure cannot cope with current traffic, and there appears to be no plan to improve this now, let alone if more houses are built. The loss of Green Belt land is totally unacceptable. Where is all the water going to go? Where is the natural habitat (both flora and fauna) going to go? What about the health implications for current residents of this area?

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3325  
Respondent: 8882881 / Andy and Sandy Homewood  
Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction

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

HOUSING NUMBERS

The housing numbers proposed are for an increase of nearly 500, which is an increase of 35% against current numbers. This percentage and overall number is too high. It does not take any account of the constraints that apply locally.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1356  
Respondent: 8889537 / Andy Los  
Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Introduction

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

The proposed changes made to site A35 Former Wisley Airfield, Ockham, are merely cosmetic and do not in any way address the fundamental issues with the proposal i.e.

1) The area is already congested with traffic pollution levels at the A3/M25 on still days above acceptable levels.
2) Existing local roads are not only congested but in an appalling state of repair.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6825  
Respondent: 8896161 / Carol Wilson  
Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction

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

Policies A1 to A57: Site allocations

I object to the inclusion of all the Green Field sites in the plan until exceptional circumstances can be proven.
I also OBJECT to the total volume of proposed houses if you add together all the following proposals: A35, A36, A37, A38, A39, A40, A41, A42. This total volume is far too high in relation to existing numbers of houses in these rural villages. The increase in West Horsley alone would be 35% which is quite disproportionate compared with other areas of the Borough. Furthermore, the density of housing proposed is far too high and far higher than existing in these villages.

In addition:

Site A36 I object as this should remain as a hotel site.

Site A37 I object as the density is too high.

Site A38 I object as the density is too high

Site A39 I object as this is flood control land

Site A40 I object as this is removing environmental benefits from a camp site which receives visitors from all over the world and would make it unviable.

Site A41 I object to the reduction of openness and visual amenity.

Site A24 Flood plain. More building anywhere exacerbates flooding.


I object because together these sites make a virtually continuous mass of bricks and mortar down the A3. Settlements merge together with no break. The Green Belt was set up to prevent this for the benefit of all. Leave it alone.

Site A35 Wisley Airfield/Three Farms Meadow Why on earth is this still in the plan? It was unanimously rejected by the Council for over 14 reasons and rightly so:

Green Belt location and absence of “exceptional circumstances”.
• Misrepresentation of the site as brownfield land: 17ha (less than 15%) is brownfield, it is adjacent to the SPA and therefore within the 400m exclusion zone for housing. The remains of the runway (14ha) are a habitat for rare flora and fauna and have never had any buildings on it. • Proximity to RHS Wisley and Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area (TBHSPA). • Proximity to A3/M25 bottleneck and Ripley village and roundabouts

Absence of adequate traffic data.

• Further harm to air quality both onsite and nearby (e.g. the Cobham AQMA) and disregard for the health of children at the proposed secondary school.
• Loss of high-quality agricultural land (55% of the site), in breach of national policy.
• Disproportion of locating of over 2,000 dwellings within the ancient village of Ockham with just 159 households.
• Presence of a Surrey County Council safeguarded waste site.
• Cost of infrastructure required to the detriment of alternative more favourable sites.
• Lack of local transport possibilities owing to country lanes with no footpaths or cycle ways and the distance to railway stations which have no spare parking capacity.
• Impact on listed buildings.
• Difficulty of SANG siting and inability to divert residents and their pets away from the SPA. • Extreme housing density with tiny garden spaces.
• Damage to neighbouring communities of creating a settlement of 5,000 residents, equivalent to East and West Horsley combined, with worse light pollution, noise and traffic, and competition for local amenities and infrastructure.
• Insufficient information about the impact on the local water table and run-off (see comments on flooding in Horsley above), and the possible aggravation of downstream flooding towards the Thames (e.g. Thames Ditton, which was under water during the winter of 2013/14).19
• Failure to evaluate the cumulative impact of this and nearby development sites on the area.
All the reasons still remain valid.

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

Attached documents:

I OBJECT to all strategic sites proposed in the draft Plan to be built in the Green Belt.

1. I object to the identification and allocation of sites in this plan without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other constraints. The plan says that “allocating these sites does not grant planning permission for development.” However, each of the sites will be removed from the Green Belt and will be available in principle for development and non-Green Belt uses. The inclusion of these sites without detailed site by site justification shows contempt for the thousands of detailed comments the Council have received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. The plan has hardly changed since the Council received 20,000 objections to its first draft plan in 2014. The Inspector considering the plan may conclude that the consultation has not been properly conducted.

2. The housing needs assessment is flawed in various respects and overstates housing need. In addition since it was produced, the referendum Brexit decision has almost certainly reduced future housing need and rendered the previous assessment seriously out of date. As a result any assessment of Green Belt sites which took place to consider whether “exceptional circumstances” existed to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt was based on false premises and should be reconsidered.

3. Having determined housing need the Council was entitled to consider constraints before determining the housing number. I believe that as III as being entitled to do this the Council was required to give proper consideration to constraints. The scarcity of sites outside the Green Belt as III as infrastructure (most notable roads) considerations all represented constraints which should have been taken into account in determining the final housing number. Accordingly in this regard our objection to the allocation of Green Belt sites is twofold. First I believe constraints should have been applied. Secondly I believe the Council did not properly consider constraints and that their decision making process was flawed and thus subject to being set aside by the Inspector.

4. Even if having properly applied constraints there is a need to develop in the Green Belt then specific Green Belt sites should not be included in the plan unless “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven in relation to that specific site, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established. There needs to be a specific balancing exercise conducted on each Green Belt site weighing the harm to the Green Belt against the very special circumstances which are argued in favour of development at that particular site. There is no evidence this has been done. Instead the council have appeared to say that having chosen a housing needs figure and decided it cannot be met without building on Green Belt then there is no need for any further consideration and any convenient Green Belt site can be allocated for building at will.

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

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to all strategic sites proposed in the draft Plan to be built in the Green Belt.

1. I object to the identification and allocation of sites in this plan without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other constraints. The plan says that “allocating these sites does not grant planning permission for development.” However, each of the sites will be removed from the Green Belt and will be available in principle for development and non-Green Belt. The inclusion of these sites without detailed site by site justification shows contempt for the thousands of detailed comments the Council have received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. The plan has hardly changed since the Council received 20,000 objections to its first draft plan in 2014. The Inspector considering the plan may conclude that the consultation has not been properly conducted.

2. The housing needs assessment is flawed in various respects and overstates housing. In addition since it was produced, the referendum Brexit decision has almost certainly reduced future housing need and rendered the previous assessment seriously out of date. As a result any assessment of Green Belt sites which took place to consider whether “exceptional circumstances” existed to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt was based on false premises and should be reconfigured.

3. Having determined housing need the Council was entitled to consider constraints before determining the housing number. I believe that as Ill as being entitled to do this the Council was required to give proper consideration to The scarcity of sites outside the Green Belt as Ill as infrastructure (most notable roads) considerations all represented constraints which should have been taken into account in determining the final housing number. Accordingly in this regard our objection to the allocation of Green Belt sites is twofold. First I believe constraints should have been applied. Secondly I believe the Council did not properly consider constraints and that their decision making process was flawed and thus subject to being set aside by the Inspector.

4. Even if having properly applied constraints there is a need to develop in the Green Belt then specific Green Belt sites should not be included in the plan unless “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven in relation to that specific site, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has There needs to be a specific balancing exercise conducted on each Green Belt site weighing the harm to the Green Belt against the very special circumstances which are argued in favour of development at that particular site. There is no evidence this has been done. Instead the council have appeared to say that having chosen a housing needs figure and decided it cannot be met without building on Green Belt then there is no need for any further consideration and any convenient Green Belt site can be allocated for building at will.

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

Attached documents:
principle for development and non-Green Belt uses. The inclusion of these sites without detailed site by site
justification shows contempt for the thousands of detailed comments the Council have received about individual
sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. The plan has hardly changed since the Council
received 20,000 objections to its first draft plan in 2014. The Inspector considering the plan may conclude that
the consultation has not been properly conducted.

2. The housing needs assessment is flawed in various respects and overstates housing need. In addition since it was
produced, the referendum Brexit decision has almost certainly reduced future housing need and rendered the
previous assessment seriously out of date. As a result any assessment of Green Belt sites which took place to
consider whether “exceptional circumstances” existed to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt was based on false
premises and should be reconsidered.

3. Having determined housing need the Council was entitled to consider constraints before determining the housing
number. I believe that as Ill as being entitled to do this the Council was required to give proper consideration to
constraints. The scarcity of sites outside the Green Belt as Ill as infrastructure (most notable roads)
considerations all represented constraints which should have been taken into account in determining the final
housing number. Accordingly in this regard our objection to the allocation of Green Belt sites is twofold. First I
believe constraints should have been applied. Secondly I believe the Council did not properly consider
constraints and that their decision making process was flawed and thus subject to being set aside by the
Inspector.

4. Even if having properly applied constraints there is a need to develop in the Green Belt then specific Green Belt
sites should not be included in the plan unless “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven in
relation to that specific site, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term
considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established. There needs to be a specific
balancing exercise conducted on each Green Belt site weighing the harm to the Green Belt against the very
special circumstances which are argued in favour of development at that particular site. There is no evidence
this has been done. Instead the council have appeared to say that having chosen a housing needs figure and
decided it cannot be met without building on Green Belt then there is no need for any further consideration and
any convenient Green Belt site can be allocated for building at will.

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

Attached documents:
consider whether “exceptional circumstances” existed to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt was based on false
premises and should be reconsidered.

3. Having determined housing need the Council was entitled to consider constraints before determining the housing
number. I believe that as Ill as being entitled to do this the Council was required to give proper consideration to
constraints. The scarcity of sites outside the Green Belt as Ill as infrastructure (most notable roads)
considerations all represented constraints which should have been taken into account in determining the final
housing number. Accordingly in this regard our objection to the allocation of Green Belt sites is twofold. First I
believe constraints should have been applied. Secondly I believe the Council did not properly consider
constraints and that their decision making process was flawed and thus subject to being set aside by the
Inspector.

4. Even if having properly applied constraints there is a need to develop in the Green Belt then specific Green Belt
sites should not be included in the plan unless “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven in
relation to that specific site, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term
considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established. There needs to be a specific
balancing exercise conducted on each Green Belt site weighing the harm to the Green Belt against the very
special circumstances which are argued in favour of development at that particular site. There is no evidence
this has been done. Instead the council have appeared to say that having chosen a housing needs figure and
decided it cannot be met without building on Green Belt then there is no need for any further consideration and
any convenient Green Belt site can be allocated for building at will.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2679</th>
<th>Respondent: 8945377 / terence cater</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( No ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( Yes )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section A22 --- An extra 10 houses will put even more pressure on the infrastructure that would be already overstretched, making it even more unacceptable to the local residents and the quite roads around the site.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3689</th>
<th>Respondent: 8945441 / Hazel A. Jarvis</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) , is Sound? ( ) , is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Traffic implications for the Tyting area

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

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

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3690  Respondent: 8945441 / Hazel A. Jarvis  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Introduction
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

2. Traffic implications for the Tyting area

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

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

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

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7210  Respondent: 8948385 / Gillian Eve  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to green field development in general and in particular to the inclusion of all Green Belt sites. Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated for the proposed development of Green Belt land.

I OBJECT to the identification of sites without regard to local housing requirements – the volume of housing allocated to rural areas bears no relation whatsoever to the actual housing requirements of those areas. The local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

I OBJECT to the identification of sites without regard to the impact on infrastructure.

All Green Belt sites should be removed from the plan until exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6186  Respondent: 8949569 / Richard Deighton  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction
Objection to Housing Development at the Scout Hut, Weston Lea, West Horsley (site 1275)

Lastly I wish to object to the inclusion in the Plan of the Scout Hut site in Weston Lea as a possible site for future residential development, even in the 11-15 year timescale ahead. The Scout Hut is a valuable resource for young people in the local community and its provision enables local Scout and Cub groups to operate entirely with local community volunteers and private fund raising, at no cost to the public purse. The loss of the Scout Hut would be a major detriment to the local community and the extra 5 houses the site would deliver are incidental to the achievement of the Local Plan. The site should therefore be reclassified as protected local community space for the duration of the Plan.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6671  Respondent: 8974177 / Nigel Mitchell  Agent:

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

I note that the strategic site include Blackwell Farm and Flexford and Normandy. These two proposed developments are in areas that cannot support the additional dwellings and other proposals because the local infrastructure is insufficient in particular the need for access and the disposal of both stormwater and sewage effluent.

Whilst future planning application will be judged under the umbrella of the Local Plan, there are a number of development proposals currently being prepared that are likely to be submitted before the Plan is adopted. The Council should take a view on these consistent with the view of the Local Plan.

In particular the proposals for the following locations

- Rokers Golf Course
- Hunts Farm
- Merrist Wood College
- Liddington Hall
- Tangley Lane
- Dandara site A246 West Horsley

It has been suggested by Guildford Colleges to their staff that they wish to develop Liddington Hall to finance improvements to Guildford College. Whilst acknowledging that the college buildings are getting old, the first option should be to refurbish and maintain them in good order. New buildings do not necessarily attract new students, a reputation for high performance however does, and this does not seem to be the case for Guildford Colleges.

Liddington Hall has also been identified within the Local Plan as being High Quality Green Belt land and provides a corridor between Whitmoor Common, Chitty’s Common and onto Backside and Broadstreet Common.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3218  Respondent: 9094753 / D Jones  Agent:
I OBJECT to all strategic sites proposed in the draft Plan to be built in the Green Belt.

1. I object to the identification and allocation of sites in this plan without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other constraints. The plan says that “allocating these sites does not grant planning permission for development.” However, each of the sites will be removed from the Green Belt and will be available in principle for development and non-Green Belt uses. The inclusion of these sites without detailed site by site justification shows contempt for the thousands of detailed comments the Council have received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. The plan has hardly changed since the Council received 20,000 objections to its first draft plan in 2014. The Inspector considering the plan may conclude that the consultation has not been properly conducted.

2. The housing needs assessment is flawed in various respects and overstates housing need. In addition since it was produced, the referendum Brexit decision has almost certainly reduced future housing need and rendered the previous assessment seriously out of date. As a result any assessment of Green Belt sites which took place to consider whether “exceptional circumstances” existed to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt was based on false premises and should be reconsidered.

3. Having determined housing need the Council was entitled to consider constraints before determining the housing number. I believe that as Ill as being entitled to do this the Council was required to give proper consideration to constraints. The scarcity of sites outside the Green Belt as Ill as infrastructure (most notable roads) considerations all represented constraints which should have been taken into account in determining the final housing number. Accordingly in this regard our objection to the allocation of Green Belt sites is twofold. First I believe constraints should have been applied. Secondly I believe the Council did not properly consider constraints and that their decision making process was flawed and thus subject to being set aside by the Inspector.

Even if having properly applied constraints there is a need to develop in the Green Belt then specific Green Belt sites should not be included in the plan unless “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven in relation to that specific site, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established. There needs to be a specific balancing exercise conducted on each Green Belt site weighing the harm to the Green Belt against the very special circumstances which are argued in favour of development at that particular site. There is no evidence this has been done. Instead the council have appeared to say that having chosen a housing needs figure and decided it cannot be met without building on Green Belt then there is no need for any further consideration and any convenient Green Belt site can be allocated for building at will.

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

Attached documents:
If the Local Plan is to be taken seriously, all facilities relating to the local infrastructure have to be taken into consideration at the consultation stage.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/89  Respondent: 9296353 / Victoria Cole  Agent:

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

To be honest I am not able to comment on whether this document meets the legal requirements as I am not a lawyer or qualified planner.

A2 - Bedford road - I do not see the need for additional restaurants here with the number of restaurants already in Guildford and the proposed conversion of the Tungate. Can this area not be used to better enjoy the river aspects.

A11 - Guildford car park - where are you proposing people park instead? This takes a reasonable chunk of parking spaces away from the station for commuters. I also strongly object to any construction similar to Woking station. It looks awful, the style of the buildings have not worn well with time and it detracts from the view of Guildford.

A12 - Bright hill - this has to be the worst proposal. How will you fit 60 homes on that site without totally ruining the aspects and views for all the other home owners in the vicinity. It is also a great venue to sit and take in the view over Guildford. Where will people park instead? If you are proposing all these new shops and restaurants, surely this means more visitors. I would rather retain this site over Sydenham Road car park, where traffic flow is a nightmare, dangerous and non moving when there is a queue for the car park which is every weekend. The council has already removed enough car parks. Provide the data that this car park is no longer required. I sincerely hope that there will be further consultation before decisions made.

On a general note it is very difficult to provide more detailed comments on proposed sites as you are not providing visuals of what is being proposed. Will you be doing so?

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2651  Respondent: 9334177 / Don Gray  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I fully support the removal of plans to develop sites A46 and A47 within the Normandy/Flexford/Wyke area. Please ensure that these sites continue to be 'washed over' by the Green Belt and thus protect this valuable resource.

I object most strongly to the proposal that the Traveller pitches (A49 and A50) be made permanent and 'inset' from the Green Belt. This proposal would create areas of 'urban' land within the Green Belt and remove Green Belt planning restrictions from these sites. This would be the 'thin end of a wedge' that would further degrade our precious Green Belt.

I also object most strongly to the proposal to 'inset' Normandy, Flexford and Walden Cottages from the Green Belt. This proposal would also create areas of urban land within the Green Belt subject to normal planning restrictions and without the protection of the Green Belt.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1977  Respondent: 9412065 / Stephen Bray  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction

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

Please find attached my further formal consultation response in respect of the above, comprising an alternative site allocation proposal, hard copy to follow.

Alternative Site Proposal: Bridge Cottage and Land Behind Ripley Lane, West Horsley

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

Attached documents: 160712 consultation response (2).pdf (3.5 MB)

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2656  Respondent: 10565569 / Sheila Mardle  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Introduction

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

I object to Policy A42 change because the 33% increase in homes from 45 to 60 not only ignores the hundreds of objections made by local Send residents previously but will impact even more and worsen considerably on access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and the junction with Send Road. As a Send Road resident I am only to aware of this fact. Also it will further erode the Green Belt in our village and worsen surface water flooding in the surrounding area. Send residents opinions seem to be totally disregarded in this latest increase of buildings.

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlicks Arch because the objections previously made by local people in their thousands have been ignored causing over-development in Send due to the excessive number of homes. This will have a disastrous impact on our local schools and doctors ability to cope with the large increase in residents. The increase in traffic in the area on our already very congested roads will totally block many of our local roads. All local people are already aware of these problems first hand on a daily basis. The need for Travelling show people plots is unsubstantiated in the area. Once again the Green belt will be eroded and the villages of Send and Ripley will be joined up. This ancient woodland is liable to frequent flooding and has existed since the reign of Elizabeth I surely it deserves to be preserved for the future.
I object to Policy A58 AT Burnt Common because its deletion from the 2014 draft due to the numerous objections and decline in demand for industrial land since the 2016 plan show there is no need for this sort of development especially in the middle of the Green Belt. This is further reinforced by the fact that Slyfield and Guildford have empty sites and industrial units. This is borne out by the 2017 Employment Land needs showing a reduction in the demand for industrial land. Importantly this development is yet another factor in gridlocking our local roads and joining up our villages.

I object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt because of its proximity to the Wey Navigation in a great countryside setting in open Green Belt and is totally inappropriate. This too will impact badly on vehicular access in both directions along Tannery Lane. ONE HAS TO QUESTION THE REASON FOR THIS APPLICATION BY THE OWNER OF SEND BUSINESS PARK.

In conclusion I a longstanding resident of Send Village (and a former Ripley resident) cannot comprehend why we have been targeted for even more disproportionate development once again. I THINK THE TRAFFIC AND POLLUTION IMPACT ON THE VILLAGE IS COMPLETELY UNACCEPTABLE TO US RESIDENTS.

We need our Green Belt especially as we know there are other alternatives for development in our borough.

Sheila Mardle

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6215  **Respondent:** 10643073 / C Prowse  **Agent:**

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

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

I must object to the draft local plan. I have grown up in Ripley and feel that the proposed developments on the old Wisley Airfield, at Garlicks Cross, the three developments in West Horsley and the traveller site at Valentines farm are too much for this area.

The developments are too large and will overload the roads and public services. The Traveller site at Valentines is on greenbelt land. Greenbelt land is precious and must be protected.

Developments should be within existing village boundaries and not result in villages expanding into open fields and countryside.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/474  **Respondent:** 10655201 / Robert Owen  **Agent:**

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

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

It is unclear what persuasive arguments have been made by the developer Taylor Wimpey to GBC such that site A46 which was not included as a development site in the draft plan should now appear. Flexford and Normandy and the land...
in between have been summarily removed from the Green Belt despite GBC policies stating the intent to prote t the green belt.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5724  Respondent: 10774145 / P Jordan  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction

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

I OBJECT to all strategic sites proposed in the draft Plan to be built in the Green Belt.

1. I object to the identification and allocation of sites in this plan without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other constraints. **The plan says that “allocating these sites does not grant planning permission for development.”** However, each of the sites will be removed from the Green Belt and will be available in principle for development and non-Green Belt uses. The inclusion of these sites without detailed site by site justification shows contempt for the thousands of detailed comments the Council have received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. The plan has hardly changed since the Council received 20,000 objections to its first draft plan in 2014. The Inspector considering the plan may conclude that the consultation has not been properly conducted.

2. The housing needs assessment is flawed in various respects and overstates housing need. In addition since it was produced, the referendum Brexit decision has almost certainly reduced future housing need and rendered the previous assessment seriously out of date. As a result any assessment of Green Belt sites which took place to consider whether “exceptional circumstances” existed to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt was based on false premises and should be reconsidered.

3. Having determined housing need the Council was entitled to consider constraints before determining the housing number. I believe that as Ill as being entitled to do this the Council was required to give proper consideration to constraints. The scarcity of sites outside the Green Belt as Ill as infrastructure (most notable roads) considerations all represented constraints which should have been taken into account in determining the final housing number. Accordingly in this regard our objection to the allocation of Green Belt sites is twofold. First I believe constraints should have been applied. Secondly I believe the Council did not properly consider constraints and that their decision making process was flawed and thus subject to being set aside by the Inspector.

4. Even if having properly applied constraints there is a need to develop in the Green Belt then specific Green Belt sites should not be included in the plan unless “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven in relation to that specific site, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established. There needs to be a specific balancing exercise conducted on each Green Belt site weighing the harm to the Green Belt against the very special circumstances which are argued in favour of development at that particular site. There is no evidence this has been done. Instead the council have appeared to say that having chosen a housing needs figure and decided it cannot be met without building on Green Belt then there is no need for any further consideration and any convenient Green Belt site can be allocated for building at will.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/695  Respondent: 10780961 / Hillary Ingle  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction
The wildlife in the garden have been around for years and are a delight to watch. Where will their food come from when their green spaces are concreted over over? I think my part of Normandy will consist of Worpleson Road, Guildford Road, Bailes Lane and Guildford itself [text unreadable] us from the rest of the village! Smaller not 'greater' Normandy of the future.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/110  Respondent: 10789921 / Kevin Allen  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction

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

The proposed plan for Guildford Borough Council (GBC) to develop the Wisley airfield site (Policy no. A35 on the plan) is inherently flawed and will have a significant negative traffic and infrastructure impact on the surrounding area of Ockham and the Horsleys.

The development is far too large and proposes over 2000 new homes supporting a population of 5-6000 new residents, in an area with an already limited and constrained transport network.

East Horsley, which is 3rd in the GBC settlement hierarchy with 3,800 residents, will be completely overshadowed by this gross proposal.

The expected overall requirement for new housing in the borough can easily be satisfied by an incremental approach, developing several areas over time - rather than a completely new Semi-Urban Village.

Sensitively expanding existing villages via low density developments would provide over 8,000 new dwellings - compared to a single 'lump' of 2,000 at Wisley (ref: Wisley Property Investments (WPI) report prepared by Savills, Nov 2013).

Increased traffic movements via the proposed road access points at the Ockham /A3 roundabout/interchange (65%?) and Old Lane (35%?), will undoubtedly cause chaos on the local road network. At peak times this interchange/the A3 are already operating at 90-95% capacity.

Proposed public transport improvements - 3or 4 extra buses? will have little effect on the access to the area for most residents. Commuting to London will realistically need to be via Effingham junction or Horsley Network Rail stations, only accessible via 2 local lanes/roads. These roads cannot possibly support (say) an extra 1-2,000 commuters trying to access the stations by car. The stations themselves have no further capacity for commuter parking, which will impact nearby residential roads.

In summary, my wife and I are completely opposed to the proposed large scale 'Semi-Urban Village' development at Wisley. We believe the documented alternative proposal for sensitive incremental development of existing villages is the option to take. This is in line with policy precedents and will provide over 4 times the amount of dwellings planned at Wisley, as required by the GBC local plan over the relevant timescale.

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

Attached documents:
**ABSENCE OF POLICY ON RIVER WEY**

**We object** to the omission of a policy for the River Wey which was included in the previous local plan. The existing policy G11 from 2003 Local Plan should be included so that development within the River Wey corridor will only be permitted provided that:

1.1.1 It protects or improves the special character of the River Wey and the Guildford and GodalmingNavigations, in particular their visual, setting, amenities, ecological value, architectural and historic interest;

1.1.2 The special character of the landscape and townscape in the corridor is protected or improved;

1.1.3 Views both within and from the corridor which contribute to this special character are protected or improved;

1.1.4 Where appropriate, public access is provided to and along the River and the Navigations.

1.1.5 The Nature Conservation value of the site is protected or improved

**GREEN BELT SITES**

**We object** to ALL Green Belt sites allocated for development in the local plan.

We object to the identification and allocation of sites in this plan without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other constraints.

The plan says that “allocating these sites does not grant planning permission for development, however, it does identify the principle of development and uses.” This ignores the tens of thousands of detailed comments the Council have received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013.

This amounts to a war of attrition by the Council in conjunction with developers, since many busy residents are sick and tired of repeating the same comments to deaf ears. The plan has hardly changed since the Council received 20,000 objections to its first draft plan in 2014.13

There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints. All Green Belt sites should be removed from the plan until “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF.

The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established.

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

**Attached documents:**
I OBJECT to the Guildford draft plan and its impact on the villages of Send and Ripley. In particular I object to plans a25, A35, A42, A43, A43a, and A44. There are many reasons for objecting to each plan individually, but in fact they should be considered as one entity since they will have a detrimental effect on the villages in their entirety.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1147  Respondent: 10834081 / Stephen Vincent  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction

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

It seems to me that some official in the planning department drew lines around possible open spaces and brown field sites on a CAD map. The official missed out the large commercial sites such as in Walnut Tree Close opposite Dapdune Wharf. With the downturn in commercial rents caused by Brexit, this is likely to remain empty like other site in North Street which look like a bomb site. Well done Guildford Borough Council. Leave the centre of Guildford derelict!

There has been no consideration to the disruption and cost of reinforcing the potable water, waste water, gas, electricity, drainage and communication networks to supply the new properties. Also there are no results of impact studies carried on the effects on increased traffic flows. For example 1100 houses in Flexford. In the mornings the whole area goes into grid lock already because of existing extra housing. What is the impact of another 1100 cars? Where do the 4 wheel drive cars from the new estates in Ripley and Wisley go at 8 am?

Have any of the executive team ever walked around Guildford on a Friday evening and see York Road, Stoke Road, Woodbridge Road at a standstill. Probably not.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5834  Respondent: 10844545 / Paul Cretney  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction

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

I have no issue with the small number of houses proposed on 5 other sites around East and West Horsley where the number of houses is less than 15 on each site

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5901  Respondent: 10844545 / Paul Cretney  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the proposed development sites in East and West Horsley on the grounds that the number of houses being proposed is excessive and wholly disproportionate to the size and supporting infrastructure of the existing villages. The local amenities (schools, doctors, public transport, roads) would be put under further severe strain with such an increase - in the absence of any mitigating measures to address these issues. Local roads are already busy enough and poorly maintained. 11

To be clear, I am objecting the each of the following site allocations:

A36
A37
A38
A39
A40
A41

I have no issue with the small number of houses proposed on 5 other sites around East and West Horsley where the number of houses is less than 15 on each site

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3266  Respondent: 10854113 / Sarah Pickering  Agent:

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

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

WE OBJECT to all strategic sites proposed in the draft Plan to be built in the Green Belt.

1. I object to the identification and allocation of sites in this plan without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other constraints. The plan says that “allocating these sites does not grant planning permission for development.” However, each of the sites will be removed from the Green Belt and will be available in principle for development and non-Green Belt uses. The inclusion of these sites without detailed site by site justification shows contempt for the thousands of detailed comments the Council has received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. The plan has hardly changed since the Council received 20,000 objections to its first draft plan in 2014. The Inspector considering the plan may conclude that the consultation has not been properly conducted.

2. The housing needs assessment is flawed in various respects and overstates housing need. In addition since it was produced, the referendum Brexit decision has almost certainly reduced future housing need and rendered the previous assessment seriously out of date. As a result any assessment of Green Belt sites which took place to consider whether “exceptional circumstances” existed to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt was based on false premises and should be reconsidered.

3. Having determined housing need the Council was entitled to consider constraints before determining the housing number. I believe that as Ill as being entitled to do this the Council was required to give proper consideration to constraints. The scarcity of sites outside the Green Belt as Ill as infrastructure (most notable roads) considerations all represented constraints which should have been taken into account in determining the final housing number. Accordingly in this regard our objection to the allocation of Green Belt sites is twofold. First I believe constraints should have been applied. Secondly I believe the Council did not properly consider
constraints and that their decision making process was flawed and thus subject to being set aside by the Inspector.

4. Even if having properly applied constraints there is a need to develop in the Green Belt then specific Green Belt sites should not be included in the plan unless “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven in relation to that specific site, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established. There needs to be a specific balancing exercise conducted on each Green Belt site weighing the harm to the Green Belt against the very special circumstances which are argued in favour of development at that particular site. There is no evidence this has been done. Instead the council have appeared to say that having chosen a housing needs figure and decided it cannot be met without building on Green Belt then there is no need for any further consideration and any convenient Green Belt site can be allocated for building at will.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8259  Respondent: 10858977 / Angela Otterson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction

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

I object to ALL Green Belt sites allocated for development in the local plan

I object to the identification and allocation of sites in this plan without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other constraints. The plan says that “allocating these sites does not grant planning permission for development, however, it does identify the principle of development and uses.” This ignores the tens of thousands of detailed comments the Council have received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. This amounts to a war of attrition by the Council in conjunction with developers, since many busy residents are sick and tired of repeating the same comments to deaf ears. The plan has hardly changed since the Council received 20,000 objections to its first draft plan in 2014.13

There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

All Green Belt sites should be removed from the plan until “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7156  Respondent: 10859553 / MARK Curtis  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction

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

GREEN BELT SITES

I object to ALL Green Belt sites allocated for development in the local plan
I object to the identification and allocation of sites in this plan without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other constraints. The plan says that “allocating these sites does not grant planning permission for development, however, it does identify the principle of development and uses.” This ignores the tens of thousands of detailed comments the Council have received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. This amounts to a war of attrition by the Council in conjunction with developers, since many busy residents are tired of repeating the same comments as it appears to be a waste of time and effort. The plan has hardly changed since the Council received 20,000 objections to its first draft plan in 2014.

All Green Belt sites should be removed from the plan until “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2421  Respondent: 10872001 / Allanah Morris  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Councils has shown an inability to provide appropriate road maintenance at the current road use for the local community.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2573  Respondent: 10876993 / Michael Hurdle  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Introduction  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send

I OBJECT to the proposed increase to 60 homes. This would add traffic not only to the A247, but also within Tannery Lane, which is narrow and without pavements, and has a poor narrow junction with the A247.

A 58 Land at Burnt Common, London Road, Send

I OBJECT to the change for a minimum of 7 000 square metres of light industrial, general industrial and storage & distribution (previously a maximum of 7 000 square metres, transferred from Garlick’s Arch)

This land is zoned permanent green belt. The Employment Land Needs Assessment (ELNA) 2017 shows a reduction in demand from 2016 in the Borough of Guildford. Industrial processes (B2) and wholesale warehousing and distribution (B8) are not regarded as suitable for the green belt. Slyfield and Guildford have unused industrial space.

The land being sought at Burnt Common could hold around seven times this minimum. This vague, open-ended proposal is inappropriate in a Local Plan.
Developments in this area rely on road networks which are already over-stretched; the A3, the B2215 from Ripley to Burnt Common, and the A247 from Clandon through Send towards Woking, which all suffer frequent congestion. The new proposals make this worse.

A25 Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow Lane

I OBJECT to the new proposal for an employment area to the north to deliver an HQ building of 7,000 square metres. This will add more traffic to the A3 and A247 which are already highly stressed.

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

To remove the three policy aspects listed above.

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2309  Respondent: 10878433 / John Townsend  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction

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

I object to the exaggerated "housing need" figure of 13,860 which is far too high and results & in the completely unnecessary development of the Green Belt. The way students, economic need and affordability are calculated inflates the housing need.

I object to all proposals to build on the Green Belt at Send and elsewhere in the borough because all the development that is really needed can be accommodated in Guildford's urban brownfield areas much closer to existing transport hubs.

I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because it would be disastrous for Send and the (A247) would be gridlocked all day.

I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25 .

I object to all the proposed sites in Send because they were not included in the previous consultation in 2014. Unlike the rest of the borough Send has not been properly consulted and all its sites have been changed substantially

I object to the development at Garlick's Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks' notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.

I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick's Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

I object to the development at Garlick's Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding.

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume.

Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.
I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/924  Respondent: 10896513 / Brian Holt  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction

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

I am writing as a committe member of Guildford City Football Club. Would you please explain why after already being passed at the first local Draft Plan planning committee meeting, Policy number 68, the community football ground on land at Gunners Farm and Bullens Farm, has now been withdrawn at the second Draft Local Plan Committe meeting, Councillors have explain, if you ask the reason why it has not been withdrawn? a explanation has to be given.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/144  Respondent: 10903073 / HEINE PLANNING (ALISON HEINE)  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction

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

Having checked, I fail to see how the allocations for Gypsy Traveller sites would deliver 43 (minimum) pitches to meet need as stated at para 4.2.22 for the period 2012-2017. Perhaps this could be made clearer. I apologise if I have failed to understand how this has been calculated but as I see it Cobbetts Close is existing with 17 pitches. Policy only proposes 3 additional pitches on this site. This table for A48-57 implies 34 additional Gypsy Traveller pitches (NOT INCLUDING a51 FOR SHOWMEN) plus 3 at Cobbetts close ie 37 new pitches (assuming all others are new and not existing with no permanent consents). I am unclear how the identified need for 43 pitches will be met 2012-2017?

I am unclear where the required 5 year supply for sites will be come from as most of these site allocations appear to address an immediate (historic need) rather than address the need for 2017 onwards for when the plan is adopted.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1242  Respondent: 10912705 / Tim Williams  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY A36: Hotel, Guildford Road

Policy A36 proposes to re-develop the current Thatcher’s Hotel for housing. EHPC is concerned about the loss of this long-standing village hotel and significant employer. However, assuming that the employment loss can be justified, (which is a condition of Policy A36), and that full consideration of the safety implications of the development being sited on a dangerous corner of the A245, then a housing development at this location, providing it is done in a manner that is in keeping with its prominent landmark position at the entrance to the village, is acceptable.

The site is also close to the East Horsley Conservation Area and housing designs and site configuration must reflect the sensitivity of this setting. My principal concern is over the number of houses proposed for this site - approximately 48 dwellings. This number gives an implied gross housing density of 37 dwellings per hectare, which is exceptionally high for this location. The average housing density across the East Horsley Settlement Area is 8.1 dwellings per hectare and the highest density found in any of the roads around this location is 13 dwellings per hectare. Development at this location would only be acceptable if it has a significantly lower housing density.

POLICY A39: Land behind Ockham Road North, near Horsley railway station

Policy A39 proposes a housing development of some 100 dwellings on a 5.7 acre green-field Green Belt site behind the houses on the western side of Ockham Road North. Access is to be secured by demolishing the first two houses next to the railway bridge. As mentioned in an earlier comment, I consider that the proposed western movement of the settlement boundary needed to bring this site within the settlement area is unjustified and contrary to NPPF rules. If this boundary movement is invalid, as I believe, then this site remains a part of the Metropolitan Green Belt. As such and with no ‘very special circumstances’ to justify housing development upon it, I object to Policy A39.

POLICIES A37, A38, A40 & A41, located in West Horsley

The LAA identifies six sites in West Horsley for potential development, the four largest having allocation policies within the Proposed Submission Local Plan. The total housing number arising from these six sites is 405 homes in total. For a village which had 1,124 dwellings at the 2011 Census, this represents a proportional increase of 36% over the plan period, an enormously high proportion by any standards. The four policy sites are all located within the Green Belt. One is a partly brownfield development but the other three sites are all open fields used for agriculture and all lie within the current Green Belt at the edge of the Settlement Area. The reasons presented by the consultants, Pegasus, in the Green Belt & Countryside Study to justify these settlement boundary movements appear to be highly questionable and in no way to meet the requirements of the NPPF that such boundary movements are only to be made in ‘exceptional circumstances’. These movements clearly represent a deliberate pushing back of settlement boundaries in order to provide more greenfield sites for housing development. As such, I consider these proposed movements in settlement boundaries to be invalid. These proposals are also contrary to the principles of the Metropolitan Green belt. West Horsley represents one of the first ‘lines of defence’ against London urban encroachment outside of the M25 circle. Yet these policies will eliminate a significant part of this defence as they seek to expand the boundaries of this village and fill-in every bit of green space within this rural setting. It is also totally contrary to the opening statement of Local Plan Policy P2 that “We will continue to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt”. It seems that in West and East Horsley at least the draft Local Plan is doing exactly the opposite. Given the scale of the development proposed in West Horsley, the inevitable destruction of its village character and the impact on infrastructure across West and East Horsley, I object to the site allocation policies A37, A38, A40 and A41.

POLICY A35: Land at former Wisley Airfield Policy

A35 proposes approximately 2,000 homes to be built on the site of the former Wisley Airfield. This will lead to the creation of the largest settlement in Guildford Borough outside of Guildford town. In effect it is proposing to create a New Town in the heart of the Surrey Green Belt. I have major concerns about this proposed development and have objected against prior planning applications at this location. I consider this proposed development to be a severe contravention of Metropolitan Green Belt policy. It will result in a New Town being created of very low sustainability which will have a major adverse impact on infrastructure across a widespread area, including East Horsley. Above all it
will cause irreversible destruction to the character of one of the most picturesque and historic areas of the country. I strongly OBJECT to Policy A35.

I endorse the detailed submission of East Horsley Parish Council outlining their arguments against this policy, which has been supplied to GBC in a separate letter.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/5732  **Respondent:** 10951105 / Richard Bray  **Agent:**

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

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

The plan also includes extensive developments at Burnt Common (400 houses & commercial developments) and Gosden Hill Farm, Burpham (2,000 houses & mixed use developments)

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/995  **Respondent:** 10971681 / Sylvie Mullen  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Introduction

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

As a resident in Ripley, I object to the new local plan put forward by Guildford Council, which are: Site A43 Garlicks Arch, Site A58 Burt Common and Site A42 Tannery Lane. I strongly believe that the plans put forward will be difficult to complete as they are unrealistic and inconsiderate.

First of all, the increase in housing numbers from 45 to 60 at Site people in Tannery Lane will have use Polesdon Lane to get to Ripley high street, as well as Woking, and the A3. Using these roads every single day, I can clearly state that Ripley and its little lanes are already majorly crowded, unable to take two-way traffic, which is dangerous as cars are already driving on pavements, putting pedestrians in danger. Also, this means that children walking and playing are endangered.

Secondly, the creation of an industrial zone and waste management within a small village seems extremely inconceivable given that this can only lead to further increased traffic, likely to be trucks, in a small residential village. This goes back to my previous comment about the safety of residents.

Finally, the inclusion of 6 x Travelling Showpeople plots with associated storage facilities is entirely inappropriate in a rural environment within the Greenbelt. The allocation of these plots would [ Response has been reacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature ] which would affect the current residents who, some, have been here for years.

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

Attached documents:
Many of the proposed changes will lead to more stressful lives

Much of the pleasure we get from living in Burpham will be lost.

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

Attached documents:

---

SITES - POLICIES A1 TO A57

I OBJECT to all strategic sites proposed in the draft Plan to be built in the Green Belt.

1. I object to the identification and allocation of sites in this plan without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other constraints. The plan says that “allocating these sites does not grant planning permission for development.” However, each of the sites will be removed from the Green Belt and will be available in principle for development and non-Green Belt uses. The inclusion of these sites without detailed site by site justification shows contempt for the thousands of detailed comments the Council have received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. The plan has hardly changed since the Council received 20,000 objections to its first draft plan in 2014. The Inspector considering the plan may conclude that the consultation has not been properly conducted.

2. The housing needs assessment is flawed in various respects and overstates housing need. In addition since it was produced, the referendum Brexit decision has almost certainly reduced future housing need and rendered the previous assessment seriously out of date. As a result any assessment of Green Belt sites which took place to consider whether “exceptional circumstances” existed to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt was based on false premises and should be reconsidered.

3. Having determined housing need the Council was entitled to consider constraints before determining the housing number. I believe that as Ill as being entitled to do this the Council was required to give proper consideration to constraints. The scarcity of sites outside the Green Belt as Ill as infrastructure (most notable roads) considerations all represented constraints which should have been taken into account in determining the final housing number. Accordingly in this regard our objection to the allocation of Green Belt sites is twofold. First I believe constraints should have been applied. Secondly I believe the Council did not properly consider constraints and that their decision making process was flawed and thus subject to being set aside by the Inspector.

4. Even if having properly applied constraints there is a need to develop in the Green Belt then specific Green Belt sites should not be included in the plan unless “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven in relation to that specific site, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established. There needs to be a specific balancing exercise conducted on each Green Belt site weighing the harm to the Green Belt against the very special circumstances which are argued in favour of development at that particular site. There is no evidence this has been done. Instead the council have appeared to say that having chosen a housing needs figure and decided it cannot be met without building on Green Belt then there is no need for any further consideration and any convenient Green Belt site can be allocated for building at will.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3361  Respondent: 10992833 / Amanda Verny White  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction

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

I OBJECT to all strategic sites proposed in the draft Plan to be built in the Green Belt.

1. I object to the identification and allocation of sites in this plan without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other constraints. The plan says that “allocating these sites does not grant planning permission for development.” However, each of the sites will be removed from the Green Belt and will be available in principle for development and non-Green Belt uses. The inclusion of these sites without detailed site by site justification shows contempt for the thousands of detailed comments the Council have received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. The plan has hardly changed since the Council received 20,000 objections to its first draft plan in 2014. The Inspector considering the plan may conclude that the consultation has not been properly conducted.

2. The housing needs assessment is flawed in various respects and overstates housing need. In addition since it was produced, the referendum Brexit decision has almost certainly reduced future housing need and rendered the previous assessment seriously out of date. As a result any assessment of Green Belt sites which took place to consider whether “exceptional circumstances” existed to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt was based on false premises and should be reconsidered.

3. Having determined housing need the Council was entitled to consider constraints before determining the housing number. I believe that as Ill as being entitled to do this the Council was required to give proper consideration to constraints. The scarcity of sites outside the Green Belt as Ill as infrastructure (most notable roads) considerations all represented constraints which should have been taken into account in determining the final housing number. Accordingly in this regard our objection to the allocation of Green Belt sites is twofold. First I believe constraints should have been applied. Secondly I believe the Council did not properly consider constraints and that their decision making process was flawed and thus subject to being set aside by the Inspector.

Even if having properly applied constraints there is a need to develop in the Green Belt then specific Green Belt sites should not be included in the plan unless “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven in relation to that specific site, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established. There needs to be a specific balancing exercise conducted on each Green Belt site weighing the harm to the Green Belt against the very special circumstances which are argued in favour of development at that particular site. There is no evidence this has been done. Instead the council have appeared to say that having chosen a housing needs figure and decided it cannot be met without building on Green Belt then there is no need for any further consideration and any convenient Green Belt site can be allocated for building at will.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3219  Respondent: 10997121 / Rob Curling  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to all strategic sites proposed in the draft Plan to be built in the Green Belt.

1. I object to the identification and allocation of sites in this plan without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other constraints. The plan says that “allocating these sites does not grant planning permission for development.” However, each of the sites will be removed from the Green Belt and will be available in principle for development and non-Green Belt uses. The inclusion of these sites without detailed site by site justification shows contempt for the thousands of detailed comments the Council have received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. The plan has hardly changed since the Council received 20,000 objections to its first draft plan in 2014. The Inspector considering the plan may conclude that the consultation has not been properly conducted.

2. The housing needs assessment is flawed in various respects and overstates housing need. In addition since it was produced, the referendum Brexit decision has almost certainly reduced future housing need and rendered the previous assessment seriously out of date. As a result any assessment of Green Belt sites which took place to consider whether “exceptional circumstances” existed to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt was based on false premises and should be reconsidered.

3. Having determined housing need the Council was entitled to consider constraints before determining the housing number. I believe that as III as being entitled to do this the Council was required to give proper consideration to constraints. The scarcity of sites outside the Green Belt as III as infrastructure (most notable roads) considerations all represented constraints which should have been taken into account in determining the final housing number. Accordingly in this regard our objection to the allocation of Green Belt sites is twofold. First I believe constraints should have been applied. Secondly I believe the Council did not properly consider constraints and that their decision making process was flawed and thus subject to being set aside by the Inspector.

Even if having properly applied constraints there is a need to develop in the Green Belt then specific Green Belt sites should not be included in the plan unless “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven in relation to that specific site, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established. There needs to be a specific balancing exercise conducted on each Green Belt site weighing the harm to the Green Belt against the very special circumstances which are argued in favour of development at that particular site. There is no evidence this has been done. Instead the council have appeared to say that having chosen a housing needs figure and decided it cannot be met without building on Green Belt then there is no need for any further consideration and any convenient Green Belt site can be allocated for building at will.

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

Attached documents:
The housing needs assessment is flawed in various respects and overstates housing need. In addition since it was produced, the referendum Brexit decision has almost certainly reduced future housing need and rendered the previous assessment seriously out of date. As a result any assessment of Green Belt sites which took place to consider whether “exceptional circumstances” existed to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt was based on false premises and should be reconsidered.

Having determined housing need the Council was entitled to consider constraints before determining the housing number. I believe that as Ill as being entitled to do this the Council was required to give proper consideration to constraints. The scarcity of sites outside the Green Belt as Ill as infrastructure (most notable roads) considerations all represented constraints which should have been taken into account in determining the final housing number. Accordingly in this regard our objection to the allocation of Green Belt sites is twofold. First I believe constraints should have been applied. Secondly I believe the Council did not properly consider constraints and that their decision making process was flawed and thus subject to being set aside by the Inspector.

Even if having properly applied constraints there is a need to develop in the Green Belt then specific Green Belt sites should not be included in the plan unless “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven in relation to that specific site, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established. There needs to be a specific balancing exercise conducted on each Green Belt site weighing the harm to the Green Belt against the very special circumstances which are argued in favour of development at that particular site. There is no evidence this has been done. Instead the council have appeared to say that having chosen a housing needs figure and decided it cannot be met without building on Green Belt then there is no need for any further consideration and any convenient Green Belt site can be allocated for building at will.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/62  Respondent: 11008033 / Sandra Reeves  Agent:

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

I object to the proposal for houses and industrial and warehousing on A43. There is no need for more houses on top of the once already proposed by the borough. This site is NEW and was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and not been previously consulted on. This is Green Belt land protected by the NPFF and is also covered in ancient woodland. A new 4-way interchange onto the A3 would be disastrous for Send and would lead to Send Road (A247) being permanently gridlocked. Send would become a through route to Woking for traffic leaving the M25 and Send cannot take this particularly with all the other proposed housing at Wisley and Burpham.

I object to the proposal to build houses and travellers pitches on A44 - Winds Ridge and Send Hill. This site is NEW and was not included in the regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted on previously. Development for housing is inappropriate due to the Green Belt status. The subsoil of this site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. It is also inappropriate to include travellers pitches given the narrow width single track country road which would provide insufficient access to the site.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3459  Respondent: 11010401 / J M Bates  Agent:
I OBJECT to all strategic sites proposed in the draft Plan to be built in the Green Belt.

1. I object to the identification and allocation of sites in this plan without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other constraints. The plan says that “allocating these sites does not grant planning permission for development.” However, each of the sites will be removed from the Green Belt and will be available in principle for development and non-Green Belt uses. The inclusion of these sites without detailed site by site justification shows contempt for the thousands of detailed comments the Council have received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. The plan has hardly changed since the Council received 20,000 objections to its first draft plan in 2014. The Inspector considering the plan may conclude that the consultation has not been properly conducted.

2. The housing needs assessment is flawed in various respects and overstates housing need. In addition since it was produced, the referendum Brexit decision has almost certainly reduced future housing need and rendered the previous assessment seriously out of date. As a result any assessment of Green Belt sites which took place to consider whether “exceptional circumstances” existed to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt was based on false premises and should be reconsidered.

3. Having determined housing need the Council was entitled to consider constraints before determining the housing number. I believe that as Ill as being entitled to do this the Council was required to give proper consideration to constraints. The scarcity of sites outside the Green Belt as Ill as infrastructure (most notable roads) considerations all represented constraints which should have been taken into account in determining the final housing number. Accordingly in this regard our objection to the allocation of Green Belt sites is twofold. First I believe constraints should have been applied. Secondly I believe the Council did not properly consider constraints and that their decision making process was flawed and thus subject to being set aside by the Inspector.

Even if having properly applied constraints there is a need to develop in the Green Belt then specific Green Belt sites should not be included in the plan unless “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven in relation to that specific site, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established. There needs to be a specific balancing exercise conducted on each Green Belt site weighing the harm to the Green Belt against the very special circumstances which are argued in favour of development at that particular site. There is no evidence this has been done. Instead the council have appeared to say that having chosen a housing needs figure and decided it cannot be met without building on Green Belt then there is no need for any further consideration and any convenient Green Belt site can be allocated for building at will.

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

Attached documents:
The policy identifies the principle of development and identifies sites within the Green Belt which is against the will of the people who live there and ignores the 20,000 objections to the previous consultation.

It has no regard for infrastructure and other constraints and doesn't make use of brownfield sites in urban areas that are alternatives.

The Green Belt should be retained in its entirety and short term housing goals shouldn't allow planners to be able to override the long term future of the Green Belt for future generations.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID: PSLPS16/6790  Respondent: 11036801 / Judith Mercer  Agent:**

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

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

I OBJECT to ALL POLICIES involving building in the GREEN BELT

As noted in P2 above, there are no "exceptional circumstances" shown. I object to the identification of these sites without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other constraints. The plan says it is not granting planning permission for developing these sites but it DOES identify the principle of development and uses. Why does it do this? In doing so it ignores many thousands of specific comments made to the Council about these individual sites since the consultation in 2013 (Issues and Options) and the plan has hardly changed since the 20,000 objections were received by the Council to the 2014 draft plan.

This amounts to the Council (and through its representatives) ignoring the law regarding Green Belt (as already mentioned above) and thereby ignoring the objections and serious concern expressed by the borough residents on the draft plan proposals put out to consultation to date. It amounts to an attempt to wear down the people through attrition. I personally and many others are sick and tired of having to repeat comments already made. Not only that but I question whether the Council by the way it has run its surveys and engagement of consultants, has been using its funds wisely.

I would ask that all Green Belt Sites should be removed from the plan until "exceptional circumstances" for development are proven as is required in the NPPF. e.g. Para 88 says that "very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt .... is clearly outweighed by other considerations". Time and again the Council has failed to provide us with justification for this draft planning on Green Belt sites/land. Short term considerations or housing "need" have been tested in court (Gallagher Homes v Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council 2014).

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID: PSLPS16/7421  Respondent: 11036801 / Judith Mercer  Agent:**

**Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction**
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to each and all policies which propose building in the Green Belt. No ‘exceptional circumstances’ have been demonstrated. As confirmed by government ministers, ‘the building of new houses does not constitute exceptional circumstances’.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3329 Respondent: 11041121 / Catherine Dean Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction

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

I object to each of the proposals to remove sites in this list from the Green Belt on the following grounds:

1. The identification and allocation of sites in this Plan is made without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other constraints. The Plan says that “allocating these sites does not grant Planning permission for development.” However, each of the sites will be removed from the Green Belt and will be available in principle for development and non-Green Belt uses. The inclusion of these sites without detailed site by site justification shows contempt for the thousands of detailed comments the Council has received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. The Plan has hardly changed since the Council received 20,000 objections to its first draft Plan in 2014. The Inspector considering the Plan may conclude that the consultation has not been properly conducted.

2. The housing needs assessment is flawed in various respects and overstates housing need. In addition since it was produced, the BREXIT referendum decision has almost certainly reduced future housing need and rendered the previous assessment seriously out of date. As a result any assessment of Green Belt sites which took place to consider whether “exceptional circumstances” existed to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt was based on false premises and should be reconsidered.

3. The Council was entitled to consider constraints before determining the housing number. I believe that as well as being entitled to do this the Council was required to give proper consideration to constraints. The scarcity of sites outside the Green Belt as well as infrastructure (most notably roads) considerations all represented constraints which should have been taken into account in determining the final housing number. Accordingly in this regard our objection to the allocation of Green Belt sites is twofold. First I believe constraints should have been applied. Secondly I believe the Council did not properly consider constraints and that their decision making process was flawed and thus subject to being set aside by the Inspector.

Having properly applied constraints if there is a need to develop in the Green Belt then specific Green Belt sites should not be included in the Plan unless “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven in relation to that specific site, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established. There needs to be a specific balancing exercise conducted on each Green Belt site weighing the harm to the Green Belt against the very special circumstances which are argued in favour of development at that particular site. There is no evidence this has been done. Instead the council have appeared to say that having chosen a housing needs figure and decided it cannot be met without building on Green Belt then there is no need for any further consideration and any convenient Green Belt site can be allocated for building at will.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4139 Respondent: 11047201 / Peter McGowan Agent:
The points that I raise with respect to traffic problems under "I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common" apply to all of the development proposals above as they will all result in additional cars on the road in and around Send. I would also point out that it is the norm rather than the exception that at peak hour, a commuter into London from Woking will not obtain a seat on a train. It is also common for trains to be delayed due to faults with infrastructure. Season tickets and car park tickets are expensive. I can only imagine how the situation will deteriorate further as a result of the above proposals.

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

Attached documents:

I OBJECT to all strategic sites proposed in the draft Plan to be built in the Green Belt.

1. I object to the identification and allocation of sites in this plan without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other constraints. The plan says that "allocating these sites does not grant planning permission for development." However, each of the sites will be removed from the Green Belt and will be available in principle for development and non-Green Belt uses. The inclusion of these sites without detailed site by site justification shows contempt for the thousands of detailed comments the Council have received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. The plan has hardly changed since the Council received 20,000 objections to its first draft plan in 2014. The Inspector considering the plan may conclude that the consultation has not been properly conducted.

2. The housing needs assessment is flawed in various respects and overstates housing need. In addition since it was produced, the referendum Brexit decision has almost certainly reduced future housing need and rendered the previous assessment seriously out of date. As a result any assessment of Green Belt sites which took place to consider whether “exceptional circumstances” existed to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt was based on false premises and should be reconsidered.

3. Having determined housing need the Council was entitled to consider constraints before determining the housing number. I believe that as Ill as being entitled to do this the Council was required to give proper consideration to constraints. The scarcity of sites outside the Green Belt as Ill as infrastructure (most notable roads) considerations all represented constraints which should have been taken into account in determining the final housing number. Accordingly in this regard our objection to the allocation of Green Belt sites is twofold. First I believe constraints should have been applied. Secondly I believe the Council did not properly consider constraints and that their decision making process was flawed and thus subject to being set aside by the Inspector.

Even if having properly applied constraints there is a need to develop in the Green Belt then specific Green Belt sites should not be included in the plan unless “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven in relation to that specific site, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established. There needs to be a specific balancing exercise conducted on each Green Belt site weighing the harm to the Green Belt against the very special circumstances which are argued in favour of development at that particular site. There is no evidence this has been done. Instead the council have appeared to say that having chosen a housing needs figure and decided it cannot be met without building on Green Belt then there is no need for any further consideration and any convenient Green Belt site can be allocated for building at will.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

We strongly object to the following specific policies on which we feel able to comment due to their proximity to our home and our use of local facilities, infrastructure and countryside.

- Policy A35 - former Wisley Airfield
- Policy 436 - Hotel, Guildford Road, East Horsley
- Policy A37 - Bell and Colvill, Epsom Road, West Horsley
- Policy A38 - Land to west of West Horsley
- Policy A39 - Land near Horsley railway station
- Policy A40 - land to the north of West Horsley
- Policy A41 - Land to the South of West Horsley
- Policy A42 - Clockbarn Nursery, Send
- Policy A43 - Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley
- Policy A45 - Land at Rear of the Talbot, Ripley

As indicated above in totality these Policies create an undesirable level of increased development in essentially rural areas and small local centres.

Individually none of the above policies should be contemplated if a pre-requisite for approval is removal of the identified sites from the green belt.

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

For the reasons stated above, I object to ALL Green Belt sites allocated for development in the local plan. I object to the identification and allocation of sites in this plan without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other constraints. The plan says that “allocating these sites does not grant planning permission for development, however, it does identify the principle of development and uses.” This ignores the tens of thousands of detailed comments the Council have received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. All Green Belt sites should be removed from the plan until “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established.
There is a large open space in front of Tesco, adjoining the hospital. Apart from breaking up what is already very low
density of development this appears to serve no real purpose apart from the occasional balloon launch, and one or two
small children’s players. At the time of writing it is just been invaded by gypsies. To my mind this would make a good
retail development site Poor possibly a residential one associated with the hospital and University and could stand
something reasonably high. The opportunity cost of it sitting there is a considerable number of million pounds. The
children’s play Area use could be retained in any new development.

Since we moved here 23 years ago the talk has been of a major retail development on North Street adjacent to the existing
Friary Centre. There has been minimal progress, and nothing to see, during this period which is a desperate indictment of
how planning policy in the town is implemented. Hopefully the proposed John Lewis store will come to pass whilst hope
that your downfall North Street will need to be pedestrianized the same extent that the High Street is i.e. closed to traffic
during the bulk of the day.

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

USE OF PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED LAND

Section 4 of the Plan under Site Allocations A1 - A58, is split into sections including ‘Previously Developed Land in the
Green Belt’.

The Plan proposes the redevelopment of two sites (A32 Surrey Police Headquarters and A33 The University of Law).
As highlighted above, the NPPF encourages ‘… the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously
developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value;’

Land at Treetops Boarding Kennels and Loxhill Nursery, Old Portsmouth Road, Guildford was assessed through the 2014
SHLAA (Site 2118) as being suitable, available and achievable for the delivery of residential development subject to a
satisfactory relationship within the Green Belt, and in relation to the AONB, conservation area and listed building. The
site’s development potential was considered to be in the order of 12 units on 2ha, at a density of just 6dph. The site was
confirmed as both available and achievable. An application for the site’s redevelopment for 39 dwellings 17/P/00801 is
currently being considered by the Council. It is considered that this application reaches a balance between making most
effective and efficient use of available previously developed land whilst still respecting the site’s environmental
constraints. The resulting density remains very low at 20dph.

Again, at paragraph 14 of the NPPF, the definition of sustainable development is confirmed:
‘For plan-making this means that:

• local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area;
• Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change.’

The effective use of such previously developed land will assist the local planning authority in meeting its objectively
assessed housing needs and in so doing respond positively to wider opportunities for growth as required by the NPPF.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/330  **Respondent:** 12191873 / Rob Woof  **Agent:**

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

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

Site A42 Clockbarn Nursery in Tannery Lane  Flooding is a concern on this site, as it has been flooded in the past. It would also increase traffic along the narrow lane which is already under stress from existing traffic flows. There is no mention of plans to improve or widen Tannery Lane or its junction with the A247

Site A43 Garlick’s Arch  will add 400 homes and 7000 sqm of various types of employment space as well as a new 4-way junction for the A3 which is need to enable development of the sites at Gosden Hill and Wisley. This site presents a significant change from the Regulation 18 consultation in 2014, where it was never mentioned or considered - this is a massive change at very late notice. The impact on local services and infrastructure by residents of 400 new homes and additional HGV traffic will be huge and no mention is made of this nor any mitigations

Site A44 Land at Wind’s Ridge and Send Hill  This is, like Garlick’s Arch, is a new addition to the LP and has not been seen before by residents. No consultation has been made - GBC has simply made a proposal, more likely with developers than residents. Anecdotal evidence suggests this site has previously been a landfill site and not suited to the proposed development

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

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1199  **Respondent:** 14149857 / GBC (Caroline Reeves)  **Agent:**

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

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

As a ward councillor for a town centre ward that will have a high number of new homes, my concern is that we are able to maintain the best in design and detailing, maintaining quality rather than quantity. Any development will add stress and strain to the current over stretched transport infrastructure, so we must make sure that we have assurances regarding the highways/transport improvements. Can we be certain of this before having to commit to developments?

Of course the other concern for all urban residents is that the loss in housing numbers in any of the strategic sites will mean more intensive development in the urban areas unless we can reduce our total housing need.

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

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1241  **Respondent:** 14181313 / Vision for Guildford Ltd - GVG (William Stokoe)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Guildford Vision Group, a group of concerned residents with very relevant commercial and professional experience, was established four years ago to press for reinvigoration of the town centre. Specifically we have called for six objectives:

1. Wider pedestrianisation of the town centre
2. Exciting new public space along a reinvigorated riverside
3. Redirection of vehicle traffic away from the centre
4. An integrated transport hub and interchange around the rail station
5. New town centre housing
6. A new and better East-West link

These are not unusual or unique objectives. They are the aim of a multitude of UK towns and cities, where many have taken positive action to bring them about. Many would envy Guildford its magnificent setting and the river running through the centre of town, yet Guildford has failed significantly over the past decades to take full advantage of its potential, especially its river. Riverside areas are taken up by surface car parks, buildings with their back to the water and suffer a legacy of piecemeal, unattractive light industrial development. Walnut Tree Close and Woodbridge Meadows, in particular, should be given over to well-planned housing and the scattered light industrial provision should be relocated to an expanded Slyfield where infrastructure and communications would be better.

We are thus disappointed by the lack of real ambition and aspiration in the Local Plan in respect of the town centre. There are no substantial coordinated policies or strategies in the Local Plan that will achieve the six objectives above. These objectives have received wide public support, as recognised by:

- Our 2013 document ‘Guildford on the Way’, a Vision for Guildford in 2030 (attached) as articulated by members of the public, Guildford residents and our members
- Comments and feedback from our public meetings over the past four years that have regularly attracted audiences of 200 and above
- Feedback from our frequent Newsletters to our supporters, interested parties and councillors

The council, in response to our lobbying, commissioned a masterplan for the centre. The masterplan was drawn up by Allies & Morrison, nationally-renowned masterplanners. The masterplan was approved by the council in March 2016 but is yet to be adopted. There is little recognition or acknowledgement of the masterplan in either the Local Plan policies, underpinning information or implementation strategies. We understand that the council propose an Area Action Plan (AAP) for the town centre once the Local Plan is adopted. We are concerned that the AAP will be subject to challenge if its aims are not foreshadowed in the Local Plan. We believe omission of any mention of the AAP could render the Local Plan unsound in this respect.

Thus all the sites below should form part of a coherent plan, in line with the approved Town Centre Masterplan.

A1: The Plaza, Portsmouth Road
A2: Guildford Cinema, Bedford Road
A3: Land between Farnham Road and the Mount
A4: Telephone Exchange, Leapale Road
A5: Jewsons, Walnut Tree Close
A6: North Street redevelopment
A7 Land at Guildford railway station
A8: Land west of Guildford railway station
A9: 77 to 83 Walnut Tree Close
A11: Guildford Park Car Park
A13: Kernal Court, Walnut Tree Close
A14: Wey Corner, Walnut Tree Close
A15: Land at Guildford Cathedral

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/12  Respondent: 15066017 / Claire Smith  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Thank you for your letter regarding the Local Plan (Regulation 19) consultation. I write regarding Treetops Kennels and Loxhill Nursery, Old Portsmouth Road, Guildford, GU3 1LN. I would like to suggest that this site is included as an allocated site in the Local Plan. It is a site considered in the Land Availability Assessment. Please let me know if I can provide any further information.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/17  Respondent: 15067361 / Nicola Adams  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

445 houses are proposed on four sites within West Horsley in addition to an undefined number of ‘windfall’ small site completions. Excluding the large site at Normandy, this represents 50% of the total proposed housing within inset villages despite representing only 20% of the current population.

The proposal places a disproportionate burden of future housing provision on West Horsley relative to other villages, the impact of which would be a significant loss of village character and stress on amenities and roads which could be better addressed through a broader distribution of strategic sites across the borough.

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

Attached documents:
### Comment ID: PSLPS16/60  Respondent: 15097697 / Lisa Bedworth  Agent:

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

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

A43 - I OBJECT - the proposal to develop the land at Garlick's Arch is NEW and was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted on previously. It is Green Belt and should not be built upon, there are no exceptional circumstances. It is an area of great natural beauty and what GBC is proposing is simply outrageous and would involve the destruction of ancient woodland. The proposed industrial development is not required and a new 4 way interchange onto the A3 would be disastrous for Send. The Send road (A247) would be gridlocked all day as it would be a through route to Woking for traffic leaving the M25 and the road infrastructure is insufficient to take this significant increase in volume of traffic.

A44 - I OBJECT - the development of the land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill is new and was not included in the regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted on previously. Any housing development is inappropriate due to its status as Green Belt land within an area of beautiful country side. I OBJECT to GBC building on Green Belt land and to the removal of Send from the Green Belt. Furthermore, the subsoil of the site contains unsafe landfill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road which does not allow sufficient access.

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

Attached documents:

### Comment ID: PSLPS16/113  Respondent: 15108225 / Moira Noble  Agent:

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

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

I consider that this plan and consultation process is flawed. The transport infrastructure of Guildford cannot support the number of new homes proposed, and the provision of health services and education facilities are inadequate. Furthermore, the proposed expansion will change the town of Guildford and its outlying regions in such a way that the plan will have a disproportionate impact than if imposed on a larger established urban environment. I consider insufficient attention has been paid to the impact of this plan on the environment, to the well being and views of the residents in the various sites under consideration and the historical organic growth of the region.

I live in Merrow and am particularly concerned about the proposed development on the Gosden Farm site. The Aldi supermarket and recent Burpham housing developments have caused considerable traffic problems already in this area. A large number of houses on the farm will change the nature of the area completely, have a devastating impact on this community and bring with it unresolvable traffic problems.

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

Attached documents:

### Comment ID: PSLPS16/135  Respondent: 15115073 / Niall Haughey  Agent:

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

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I note that there are 445 houses planned for Horsley in the area just north of the railway station. (Site allocations A38, A39, A40, A41).

I do not believe the Community Infrastructure Levy will be adequate to cover additional primary school places in Horsley, given an existing shortage of places for those in the village.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/154  Respondent: 15125729 / Irene Burrows  Agent:

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

I object to Policy A43. Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common & Ripley, designated for 400 houses and 7,000 sq.m of industrial & warehousing. This site is new and was not included in regulation 18 draft. It has not been consulted upon previously. It is Green Belt permanently protected by the NPPF which prevents the merging of settlements. There are no exceptional circumstances. The proposed industrial development is not required since the latest ELNA 2015 assessment shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from previous plan. If needed, this development should be at Slyfield.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/155  Respondent: 15125729 / Irene Burrows  Agent:

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

I object to Policy 43A. A 4 way interchange on to the A3 at Burnt Common. This would increase traffic through Send & Ripley from the A3 to Woking and to the M25 when there are problems on the A3. The villages would be gridlocked with traffic, already heavy at peak times with school runs and rush hour journeys. Lack of infrastructure and forethought.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/156  Respondent: 15125729 / Irene Burrows  Agent:

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

I object to the last minute inclusion of this policy into the local plan. The revised plan submitted to the GBC Executive in April lowered the housing in Send to 185, the Garlick's Arch proposal added in May increased the number to 485 and will cause pressure on the local medical centre and school, neither of which has capacity for such large increases.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/170  Respondent: 15130625 / Joan Alldis  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the soundness of the evidence provided by GBC because the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows an 80% reduction in employment space from the previous ELNA carried out by GBC in 2013; meaning the industrial space at Burnt Common is no longer needed. Housing numbers derived from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2015 (SHMA) are highly questionable. The number of foreign students has been incorrectly used to inflate the numbers. The required 13,860 homes in the local plan is exaggerated. On the premise that the population grows by some 20,000 in the plan period, there will be a need for 8,000 homes (based upon an average of 2.50 persons per home). Therefore, the green belt does not need to be utilised for the building of homes. 50% of new homes could be built on brownfield sites. GBC's Transport Assessment was not available to councillors for the vote taken on 24.05.16 as it was not published until 06.06.16. Infrastructure overload has received scant consideration and attention.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/194  Respondent: 15137249 / Sue Stubbs  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I support the plans for retaining the allotments as is on Broadacres - the parking is very bad at the Moment -with the homes as you come into Broadacres park along the road up towards Oakfields - even coaches and taxis !

46 Broadacres

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/238  Respondent: 15143137 / Katie Zimmer  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Let alone the natural beauty and vista that will be ruined by building an obscene amount of houses in the way. Only a matter of weeks ago, I parked up on the Hog’s Back to take a photo of the London Skyline (attached). How could you possibly consider ruining this for people?!

I completely and utterly object.
Currently, during rush hour in the morning, there are lengthy tail backs on the A3 heading north, the A31 towards the A3 interchange, the A3 interchange with Egerton Road and the Research Park/Royal Surrey/Sports Park complex. The amount of current traffic issues in this area already results in major delays for motorists. A decision to build the number of new houses proposed at Blackwell Farm, with A3 access via Down Place or Egerton Road, would significantly add to traffic congestion in the whole area. only adding further to delays on the A3, the A31 and access to the Research Park area. During the evening rush hour, traffic on the A3 currently often tails back to Burpham and there is significant congestion on the northern edges of the town with traffic seeking to join the A3.

It is essential that considered and significant new road infrastructure is in place prior to construction of any new housing at Blackwell Farm. Infrastructure needs to be capable of handling what is likely to be over 3-4,000 additional cars, plus delivery vans and lorries, buses, taxis etc. Merely adapting the Down Place and Egerton Road interchanges will not ease current A3 or A31 traffic, nor facilitate the extra traffic from this development.

From the proposals as presented, insufficient consideration has been given to road network improvements around the suggested Blackwell Farm development (whether or not the 'tunnel' ever sees the light of day) - both Surrey County Council and National Government should be involved in creating an infrastructure plan that will reduce congestion in the event these proposals go ahead, not increase it.

The proposal to develop 1100 new homes with no genuine improvements to the road infrastructure needs to be reconsidered. The A323 already carries a high level of traffic during rush hours heading both East and West. Westwood Lane and Glaziers Lane are relatively narrow roads that currently have lengthy traffic queues during rush hours, especially at the A323 junction. The B3000 through Wanborough is a narrow country road with major traffic congestion currently at the junction with the A31 during both rush hours. In the morning on Wanborough Hill and towards the A3 junction, in the evening on Puttenham Hill and on the A31 slip road.

1100 new houses in the Normandy/Flexford area will only add to this congestion, especially if a new school is built with the additional traffic that would entail.

Much more consideration needs to given to developing a workable road infrastructure that will ease congestion rather than adding to it and this needs to be in place prior to any additional housing development.

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

**Attached documents:**
I object to the adoption of the New Local Plan relating to the following sites and object to each one on the grounds set out below:

1) Site A25 Gosden Hill Farm - this site along with Site A35 and Send, Burnt Common and Ripley village sites A42, A43 and A44 account for almost 50% of the new homes planned by Guildford Borough Council. The transport and community infrastructure are currently and as proposed completely inadequate to support the proposed development.

2) Site A35 Land at former Wisley Airfield - this site along with Site A25 and Send, Burnt Common and Ripley Village sites A42, A43 and A44 account for almost 50% of the new homes planned by Guildford Borough Council. The transport and community infrastructure are currently and as proposed inadequate to support the proposed development.

3) Site A42 Clockbarn Nursery - This site along with Sites A23 and A35 and Send, Burnt Common and Ripley Village sites A43 and A44 account for almost 50% of the new homes planned by Guildford Borough Council. The transport and community infrastructure are currently and as proposed inadequate to support the proposed development.

4) Site A43 Land at Garlicks Arch - This site along with Sites A23 and A35 and Send, Burnt Common and Ripley Village sites A42 and A44 account for almost 50% of the new homes planned by Guildford Borough Council. The transport and community infrastructure are currently and as proposed inadequate to support the proposed development.

5) Site A43A Land at Burnt Common- This site is to provide new access onto the A3. Currently both Send Road and the centre of Ripley are already congested with Local traffic. the provision of a new slip road to the A3 will divert Woking to London traffic, which currently goes via Ripley Village centre, to now move to Send and provide additional congestion to that currently experienced and that which is proposed by the imposition of Sites A25, A35, A42, A43 and A44.

6 Site A44 Land at Winds Ridge, Send Hill - This site is proposing to introduce further housing onto a Lane that already is inadequate for current traffic and add more traffic to exit from Send Hill onto Potters Lane which is a blind junction and already has been responsible for a considerable number of serious accidents.

In particular I object to the proposed blanket destruction of the Green Belt in an area affecting Burpham, Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley which is totally in contravention of the Government's commitment for the Green Belt.

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

Attached documents:
**Comment ID: PSLPS16/7365  Respondent: 15216129 / Timothy Hewlett  Agent:**

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

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

RIPLEY, SEND AND CLANDON

Please find attached my letter *objecting to the inclusion of the above locations* in the revised draft Guildford Borough Council Local Plan.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID: PSLPS16/654  Respondent: 15225281 / Roger Gamlin  Agent:**

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

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

I Object,

Greenbelt is a precious resource and once destroyed can never be recovered.

In particular I object to Land at Garlick's Arch being developed. 400 houses are far too many, the area of Ripley and Send can not sustain such urbanisation. The roads are already too busy, this will totally destroy it. The junction at A3 is not needed.

Send should not be removed from Greenbelt.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID: PSLPS16/666  Respondent: 15225857 / BlackOnyx Developments limited  Agent: AECOM (Philip Scott)**

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

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

**LAND SOUTH OF NEW POND ROAD, FURZE HILL LANE, FARNCOMBE, GODALMING GU7 3NP**

On behalf of my client Blackonyx Developments Ltd please accept and register formal representations to the Borough Council’s Proposed Submission Local Plan (Regulation 19) in relation to the Proposed Submission Borough wide Strategy and additionally the omission of land south of New Pond Road, Furze Hill Land, Farncombe from the list of sites proposed for future housing development.
These representations confirm our objection to the following Proposed Submission policies:

- Omission site: Land south of New Pond Road, Furze Hill Lane, Farncombe

Background

The omission site forms the eastern part of a larger 16 hectare linear area of land which is dissected by Furze Hill Lane immediately abutting the north-eastern edge of Farncombe. Farncombe itself is a sustainable, accessible settlement which flows seamlessly into Godalming town, both settlements lie in the borough of Waverley. Farncombe and Godalming incorporate a wide range of services, amenities, schools, employment opportunities, local retail stores, and a mainline railway station (serving London). The railway station is just 0.7 mile from the omission site.

[IMAGE 1]

The omission site comprises undeveloped fields with a scattering of individual mature trees. The whole site lies within the existing extent of the designated Green Belt. Two established vehicular access points serve the omission site together with laid tracks, one access point is formed via the eastern side of Furze Hill Lane which runs along the entirety of the western boundary of the omission site whilst a further access point exists directly via New Pond Road (B3000) which runs along, and defines, the northern boundary of the omission site. The eastern site boundary is formed by vegetation running alongside the mainline railway line. Contiguous with the southern boundary of the omission site is land which lies within the administrative area of Waverley Borough Council and which now benefits from planning permission for residential development (50 dwellings).

In short therefore, the omission site lies entirely within (bounded by) defined man-made physical features along all boundaries, and is contiguous with a substantial committed residential development.

Additionally, the visual appearance of the omission site is significantly impacted due to the nature of a variety of structures including caravans, motor homes and vehicles which have been in-situ on the site for a number of years.

[IMAGE 2]

Existing access track and established residential community residing on the omission site

The omission site has, until now, been promoted for housing development. The housing potential of the omission site was identified in the Borough Council’s Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (June 2014) and was assessed as part of the Green Belt and Countryside Study (2014), these evidence base studies led to the site subsequently being included as a draft housing allocation in the Borough Council’s draft new Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (July 2014) as site No 80. However, the omission site does not appear in the Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016).

Green Belt

The majority of the borough is washed over by the Green Belt. Paragraph 79 of the Government’s National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) recognises the importance of Green Belt in preventing urban sprawl and keeping land open. The policy emphasises that an essential characteristic of Green Belts are their openness. Paragraph 80 of the NPPF sets out the five core purposes served by Green Belt:

- to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
However, notably, in paragraph 84 of the Green Belt policy section, whilst acknowledging the importance of Green Belt the Government also directs local planning authorities to promote sustainable patterns of development by channelling new development towards towns and villages, and in paragraph 85 of the NPPF the Government makes it abundantly clear that when defining Green Belt boundaries, LPAs should:

- **not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open.**

The Borough Council has publicly recognised that the extent of the Green Belt is seriously impeding its ability to deliver housing and meet its housing land supply requirement. In that regard, the Borough Council commissioned an independent and objective assessment of the Green Belt and Countryside as part of the emerging new Local Plan Evidence Base. The five volumes of technical evidence forming the ‘Green Belt and Countryside Study (2014)’ assessed the quality and contribution that the omission site makes to the openness of the Green Belt and to the characteristics of the AONB and the Study concludes that the site (identified in the Study as area ‘F6-B’) “provides opportunities to accommodate development without significantly compromising the purposes and openness of the Green Belt”.

**Housing Land Supply Position**

The introduction of the Government’s National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) directs local planning authorities to deliver a step change in the supply of housing by meeting ‘objectively assessed’ housing needs (NPPF, paragraph 47). Given that Borough Council’s adopted Local Plan housing provision policy is out of date and there are no ‘saved’ policies in place that address development needs beyond 2006, GBC is out of step with the NPPF in relation to housing delivery. Additionally, the borough has a significant housing land supply shortfall when measured against a five year housing land supply.

We are aware that the West Surrey Strategic Housing Market Assessment (‘SHMA’) suggests the borough’s population is expected to grow by 15% (21,179) over the Plan period. Taking into account these figures together with the adjusted household formation rates, the SHMA (2015) concludes that the objectively assessed overall housing need (OAN) for Guildford borough is **693 dwellings per annum (dpa)** over the Plan period.

Additionally, we note that the Borough Council openly acknowledges the acute housing shortfall within the Annual Monitoring Review (‘AMR’) 2013/14 (page 8). Notably, the AMR states that, “we are not currently able to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing land without amendments to the Green Belt boundaries and use of countryside land”. Whilst the number of new homes constructed across the borough has increased, the number of deliverable houses completed last year was 242 dwellings. However, this is still substantially below the identified target need per annum (as set out in the SHMA 2015) and there continues to be a growing housing deficit in the borough.

As at June 2015 the Borough Council’s annual Monitoring Report confirms that Guildford’s total five-year requirement is 5,165 homes. To date, the Borough Council can demonstrate **2.4 years supply** (2.5 years supply if pending applications in Ash and Tongham are included) against the identified need of 693 dwellings per annum. In this context, more housing land is required during the Plan period to meet acute need in the borough. The omission site can play an important part in helping to meet the acute shortfall of housing in the borough.

**Land Availability Assessment (LAA) January 2015**

The omission site is identified in the LAA (January 2015) as site **No. 2241 Land at New Pond Road, Shalford**. The LAA has discounted the omission site from the range of housing sites that were draft allocated in the July 2014 Local Plan. In this respect the LAA states that the omission site is not in accordance with the Sustainability Appraisal (June 2016) because the omission site is in medium sensitive Green Belt in the AONB. However, it is highly notable that there has been no site-specific assessment of the omission site’s credentials and the Sustainability Assessment only provides generalised performance criteria. In this respect:

- The omission site is now contiguous to a sustainable settlement (given the recent planning permission for 50 dwellings directly adjacent to the omission site),
- Comments received to application PA Ref. WA/2014/1330 adjacent the omission site from the Surrey Hills AONB representative state that this area does not significantly contribute to the AONB,
• The Council is promoting major greenfield land in the Green Belt for housing which score twice as many red sustainability performance markers as the omission site.

We consider that the Council’s decision to discount the omission site lacks credibility.

**Related Matters**

In addition to the Local Plan Evidence Base reports, the Borough Council will be mindful that since the publication of the draft Local Plan (July 2014), Waverley Borough Council has granted planning permission for 50 dwellings (PA Ref WA/2014/1330) on land immediately south of the omission site. The decision of Waverley Borough Council effectively means that the omission site lies contiguous with land which will form part of the built-up part of Farncombe and within a clearly identifiable (and defensible) boundary of New Pond Road (B3000).

Under these circumstances, and in light of the established uses on the omission site, it is clearly not appropriate to draw the Green Belt boundary along the southern boundary of the omission site and it is unnecessary to keep it permanently open given there is a very significant defensible boundaries created by New Pond Road (B3000) and the railway line.

I trust that in advancing the new Local Plan the Borough Council will reconsider its decision to discount the omission site, and instead promote the omission site for housing development as it has done previously in accordance with the SHLAA (2014), the Green Belt and Countryside Study (2014), and the draft new Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (July 2014), and in light of Waverley Borough Council’s resolution to approve PA Ref. WA/2014/1330 which effectively means that land south of New Pond Road is contiguous with the built-up part of Farncombe and has clear and defensible man-made boundaries.

I would be very grateful if you would confirm that these representations **objecting** to the Proposed Submission Local Plan have been registered and are ‘duly made’.

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

**Attached documents:**
- [image 2 aecom.jpg](image 2 aecom.jpg) (165 KB)
- [image 1 aecom.jpg](image 1 aecom.jpg) (537 KB)
The document does not cooperate and listen to the views of the ACTUAL PEOPLE that live in the green belt. Some big wigs trying to make some money do not have as valid an opinion and say as the people that already live somewhere and DON’T WANT TO SEE THE PLACE RUINED.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1169  Respondent: 15244097 / Persimmon Homes (Craig Hatton)  Agent:

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

Please see the attached representations which provide our comments in greater detail

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

Attached documents:  Ripley reps.doc.pdf (4.8 MB)

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1133  Respondent: 15247809 / Christopher McLaughlin  Agent:

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

Dear Councillors:

I'm writing to express my disbelief at the bogus proposal to forever destroy green belt land in Normandy and Flexford, while increasing the size of our village by 100%, on the basis that a school is justified in our location named A-46 in the draft local plan. What is proposed is wrong on every level, including scale, when David Cameron himself has said repeatedly that "we will always protect the Green Belt and make sure planning decisions are made by local people." Where was any consultation with the residents of Normandy and Flexford? Given the 100% opposition to this by the residents of Normandy, you seem not to be concerned about our wishes. However the proposal should fail on the basis that a school in location A46 is simply not required by any reasoning. In no particular order:

Green Belt - The Green Belt was enacted by forward thinking visionaries who knew the value of open space for future generations, before the importance of battling climate change was even thought about. In fact, Surrey was a leading advocate for its creation. Yet you propose to create a continuous concrete strip from the west of Aldershot right through to the east of Guildford that will affect the physical and mental wellbeing of all, while specifically sentencing the residents of our small village to a lifetime of noise, pollution, traffic stress, all health and safety nightmares, for the short term gain of a greedy developer and some short sighted local government officials who will be remembered by history as those who destroyed what was once meant to be preserved for the good of the nation. One of the characteristics of the green belt is that a sense of "openness" is preserved. How does this concrete strip allow for that? The green belt in Normandy is a vital part of the barrier between Ash and Guildford. Flooding, traffic, and accidents on the A323 already drive an intolerable amount of traffic onto our D roads. This proposal will result in permanent gridlock. Your stated aim of development is to concentrate on brownfield sites yet 70% of the development you now propose is on greenfield sites, including green belt land, to the detriment of all. Why are you not developing Wisley Aerodrome and its miles of concrete? Or all of the brownfield sites within Guildford itself where the need for expansion exists. And two motorways and Major A road? Instead, because of a developer led whim, you chose our little village.
Transportation and road infrastructure - Normandy with its tricky intersections, narrow lanes, with parked cars narrowing them still further, the one lane railway tunnel on Westwood Lane, unaddressed in the plan, that daily sees accidents and near misses are totally unsuitable for this scale of development. Turning onto the A323 from Westwood Lane is already hazardous and where Glazier's Lane meets Westwood Lane, approaching traffic cannot easily be seen, usually is doing 40 mph+, and again, near misses are common. The railway bridge on Glazier's Lane is narrow, traffic is difficult to see, and among these various traffic risk areas, no improvement can be foreseen that will allow the additional thousands of journeys per day, let alone tens of thousands of vehicle movements that will arise from the proposed development. Pedestrian pavements are at times dangerous and generally entirely inadequate with awful street lighting. There is insufficient space for bicycle paths. And the Wanborough railway station is tiny and there is no scope for making it larger, nor are there plans to enlarge it during the lifetime of the plan. Due to the bridges, double decker buses will never be able to run through this area.

Where Wanborough Hill meets the Hog's Back, again this very steep hill with numerous traffic issues feeds into an already congested A31 and to dump many more thousands of car journeys daily into this area will simply grind the whole place to an absolute halt. It is already backed up every morning and a journey to Guildford can take 30-40 minutes NOW. Lip service has been paid to “improving” this terrible intersection without stating how it will be funded adequately. And will you shave the top off the Hog's Back to make it wider so you can fit more lanes in to funnel the vastly increased traffic onto the impossible to widen A31? How will that increased traffic be then directed onto the A3 or down the hill into town? Locally, our roads will exceed their design capacity almost continuously.

And you can’t just put speed bumps everywhere and say the problem is solved. THE ROADS ARE SIMPLY UNSUITABLE AND WILL NOT TOLERATE THIS INCREASE IN TRAFFIC. it has been mentioned that the railway station is one of the things that makes this project sustainable. How is Wanborough with a tiny station, tiny platform, sporadic service, no parking, adequate for the thousands of new people? So it's back to cars and pollution and stress and gridlock. Hardly the hallmarks of modern sustainability. Once we add the school runs for the proposed "free school," this falls apart even quicker on every major quality of life measure. Adding a percentage to a settlement is one thing. Doubling and destroying it is entirely another.

Need for a school - In order to develop the green belt, there must be an EXCEPTIONAL NEED. So far as we can all see, the only need is for Taylor Wimpey to make a quick buck. Paul Spooner is on record as saying that "a school or hospital would trump all other planning considerations. So Taylor Wimpey have pulled a school out of their hat in the two years that talks have apparently been taking place, presumably to try and circumvent planning rules.

Yet there is plenty of space at local schools as yet unfilled and recent planning decisions have included the decision NOT to tear down an existing school as there was insufficient need to destroy it versus harm to the green belt. Virtually every school in the Borough of Guildford is undersubscribed at the moment, some by as much as 60%. A better location might have been Blackwell Farm. A school is currently being built in Mayford on the side of the borough where the need is greatest. Ash has plenty of vacancies and our proximity to Hampshire and the schools it has are not considered or discussed. Normandy has an aging population with very few school age children while the birth rate in Guildford is declining. A questions was asked at a local meeting recently: “How many people have kids 12-16 in school here now?” 6 hands went up out of 300. A 20 y/o girl said she had NO friends here in school while she was in school. A huge new school that there is no need for in a place that neither needs nor wants it is a huge unsustainable cost. It is better to expand existing schools and why not try and fill the existing ones up in the first place? To which the new one in Mayford can be added.

If we add to this the destruction of ancient woodlands, flood prone and muddy clay soil, dangerous traffic conditions for the students due to inadequate roads, it becomes even more unsustainable.

And why 1100 houses? - Is that perhaps because Taylor Wimpey says so? Even though that scale of development will be catastrophic for all of our residents? With half a dozen supermarkets and large retail shopping areas within ten minutes drive, it's no surprise that every Normandy business, pub, etc. (with the exception of the niche motorcycle parts store) has closed down over the last twenty years. The shop, the post office, Spar market, all of them. So throwing in a little market won't make anything better and will merely add to the car journeys until it closes too.

On your own website you say that the "Local Plan will help tackle the borough's potential housing crisis." So we have houses that are only "potentially" needed, in an area that doesn't require a school. THIS IS NOT THE EXCEPTIONAL
NEED THAT IS REQUIRED TO OVERTURN GREEN BELT DESIGNATION. It is exceptional greed at the expense of an entire village and the law does not provide for the whimsical destruction of green belt land when so many alternatives exist. And there is a long and proud track record with such developments of building and selling all the houses only to find that there are insufficient funds to pay for the promised school. Let alone the road improvements that are alluded to. Post-Brexit, England will likely see a decrease in immigration to go with the declining birth rate in Guildford. It was interesting to note that trading in shares of Taylor Wimpey was suspended after the announcement of the Brexit referendum result.

Environment - In the last local plan, the site was given a "red" level of sensitivity. We have 22 listed building in Normandy, 7 within the perimeter of this so called development. We have 500 year old trees right in the middle of it. We have bats, badgers, newts, hedgehogs, extensive native species of birds, flowers, etc. Bats every night right now. Has anyone noticed that we flood here? Has a proper assessment of flooding risk been made? Or the added burden to our surrounding protected nature areas? The Thames Basin Heath SPA is just across the A323 and will suffer terribly as a result of the vastly increased traffic, pollution, dog walking, etc. Light pollution will adversely affect the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Let alone the destruction of Green Belt land itself. To quote our MP, Jonathan Lord, "it is simply inexcusable to build here."

3850 homes for 5000 people were proposed in Aldershot on MOD land. GBC responded in 2013 to say that the impact on Surrey roads was not considered. Particularly the A323. Yet this proposal would add catastrophic amounts of traffic to all local roads.

I could go on forever. But why are the local residents being ignored when not a single one of us moved here for the "exciting opportunity to have our lives thoroughly blighted, as a whole community, for decades to come!!" Why have none of the important impact things been looked at at all? Why are you proposing to act contrarily to the intent of the green belt legislation meant to preserve at least a little ring of life outside London for your kids and theirs? Where are they going to go to escape the pollution, traffic danger and chaos this will bring? Why aren't the needs of Guildford being addressed by providing infrastructure near the town where the demand and ability to absorb it is? And there is ABSOLUTELY NO EXCEPTIONAL NEED FOR THIS SCHOOL AND DEVELOPMENT SUCH THAT VIOLATING THE GREEN BELT IS REQUIRED OR DESIRED BY ANY CITIZEN. None of us have done anything to deserve this death sentence for our little community.

In summary, as for legal compliance, this proposal rides roughshod over green belt legislation without there being an exceptional need, nor any need for a school in this location and it is hugely detrimental to nearby legislated areas. As far as soundness goes, it does not achieve sustainable development nor is it justified or effective in any way. In fact, it is entirely unjustified. And to say that there has been any compliance with a duty to cooperate is an absolute joke. This development has been sprung on us without warning, and with minimal time to respond. The whole thing stinks, in fact, of absolute dishonesty from stem to stern.

Thank you for taking the time to read this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/935  Respondent: 15253825 / David Morgan  Agent:

| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |

A22 proposed building on land north of Keens Lane Guildford.

Keens Lane has recently been developed by the creation of Sime Close and Morgan Close.
Keens Lane itself has not had any infrastructure improvement for vehicular movement from Keens lane onto Worplesdon Rd, nor where traffic join Aldershot Rd from Gravetts Lane.

An additional 140 homes would see another 280 vehicles using this area on a daily basis. Significant alterations would be required to the road network. this would not be in keeping with the current environment.

I object to the suggestion of building homes on this green belt site.

This would be to the detriment of local amenities enjoyed by current residents.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1096  Respondent: 15267521 / Land Owner of Hornhatch Farm  Agent: Scott Brownrigg Planning (Natalie Walter)

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction

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

The table should include an additional allocation: “Land at Hornhatch Farm.”

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1137  Respondent: 15273761 / marcus lines  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction

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

I have grave concerns about policy "A26 Blackwell Farm" and the infrastructure plans for primary vehicular access via a signalised junction of the A31 and Down Place. The A31 is blighted by several miles of tail-backs during rush-hour where it feeds on to the A3. Living on the Hogs Back it can take over 30mins to access the A3 or Guildford centre. Without first addressing the problems of the A31 access to the A3, creating a controlled junction as traffic filters down into Guildford centre will further exasperate congestion.

I read in the policy documents that further housing development will be considered once problems with the A3 have been eased. Will not a proportion of traffic from the proposed 1800 new homes be also using the A3. As a daily user of the A3 through I feel it is the area's biggest problem. The council must address the issue of traffic flow onto and along the A3 through Guildford before allowing more development.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1144  Respondent: 15273889 / Corrine Mclaughlin  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Objection to the destruction of Normandy and Flexford

To whom it may concern

Please find attached a letter that I have submitted in response to the proposal of GBC building in the green belt area of Normandy and Flexford. As stated in this letter, after investigation there is no exceptional need for these houses or a new school in our village. I ask that you advocate on behalf of our residents, so our community is not ruined by local developers driven by their own personal needs and not that of our community.

Dear Councillors

I am responding to the proposal of Guildford Borough Council (GBC) building on the green belt area in Normandy and Flexford, area 46 (A46). I strongly object to the plans for development of 1100 new houses and a new secondary school in this area. I will highlight the reasons I am against these proposed plans to build, and the negative impact they will have on the community, infrastructure, environment, and public health of the villagers.

The Community

Many residents who live in the proposed development site in Normandy and Flexford are middle age, or senior citizens. Most have lived in this area all of there lives or those who have moved into this area have done so because they chose to be within a small population and uncrowded area. People in my community have opted to live without traffic and noise of towns, and have chosen to have a rural, quiet, quality of life. This being a greenfield site and classed as an area of outstanding beauty (AONB) is part of the attraction in which people came to live this urban area in the first place. The safeguards to upkeep British countryside and uphold protecting village communities was part of the government's promise. Normandy and Flexford have being classed as a high sensitivity area as noted in 2014 draft local plan. David Cameroon also stated regarding such areas, "the government will protect green fields, and consult local residents in planning of green belt areas".However despite this statement, the community have not been informed or made aware that our community has been downgraded to a new strategic site for development approved by GBC. This May, by chance, residents heard second hand that the development of Taylor Wimpey for 1100 houses and secondary school was being considered, and on the 6th June, shockingly the GBC approved this draft plan with a six week consultation period.

The Infrastructure and Environment

The Oxford dictionary's definition of a lane is "A narrow road especially in a rural area". A narrow road or a lane has limited structure for regular heavy traffic such as Westwood lane and Glaziers lane. Westwood lane has a low bridge connected to Wanborough railway station, and driving under it is narrow, with only space for one vehicle at a time to pass through. How would traffic for the school run a and associated traffic cope on a road design for rural traffic. Many local residents like myself and family included are stunned and angry at this action and feel there is neither a need or requirement for new houses or a new secondary school in a community with mainly retired or senior aged residents. Government states that new schools are built when there is an exceptional need and pupils are in 95% capacity, but local schools in Normandy area are under subscribed(one school max 60% capacity). As stated in the Provision for Education in Surrey annual report in December 2015, no new schools were needed in the area and were not included in the recent 10 year plan. So why is a new secondary school planned with no exceptional need? This developer driven school appears to be an unnecessary waste of open space and a way of justifying building of the non-required 1100 houses. Destroying precious rural land when the government has stated that brownfield sites would be used before damaging greenfield sites appears to be happening in the case of A46.
I have also seen traffic backed up for hours on the Hog's Back trying to exit the top of Westwood lane and also to enter it. If more houses were built, the increase movement of traffic will not only be less safer for pedestrians, it will be detrimental to the quality of roads and also increase the need for road works and resurfacing improvements. At the moment with heavy rain in the village, the roads flood, driving can be precarious, and drainage is difficult. With an increase of people in the proposed new 1100 new houses, the roads would not be able to cope. The noise would greatly increase, and air pollution have an negative effect on people, animals and wildlife.

If new residents from the proposed new houses with children move to our area, they will find limited facilities, no stores, shops. If families decide to use our small village local train station in Wanborough, the schedule is infrequent and limited. Extra cars parking here would increase congestion at this site, as there are few parking spaces in the small cul-de-sac opposite the station. A drive to shops in local village of Ash Vale or Guildford would also increase the burden of traffic on the roads.

As I said, Normandy is a rural village, with limited infrastructure, our small country doctors practice which is already over stretched with current residents will be oversubscribed if it was to include people in the new proposed 1100 houses. Normandy as stated before is a AONB, it has several deer, rabbits, badgers, and various wildlife. Due to the peaceful surroundings, it also attracts birds, bats and snakes. There is a diverse selection of flora and fauna. If the new houses and school are developed in this area the traffic increases on the two lanes (Westwood and Glaziers) in A46 will have a detrimental effect on enticing and retaining wildlife into the area.

Public Health

As mentioned before the Increased of air pollution will have an negative an effect both humans and animals, as will the additional of increase noise.

As a resident of 20 years in Normandy and living on this proposed development site, I feel vulnerable and intimidated by the thought of "bully boy approach" of GBC approving of development on land that was never intended be built on. Promises to consult residents have not been adhered to, and the well being and input of current home owners have not been considered.

Please do not allow destructive opportunistic development in the guise of needs of local people go ahead. Forward thinking planners of GBC and developers would be better off engaging with the community so they can gain a realistic awareness of the lack demand for implementing A46.

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

Attached documents:
away from the town centre as possible. A more honest statement would be London needs another commutable suburb. To the North of Ash Green Road is actually Ash Green as proven by the map in use, this should therefore have been included in the Ash Green map and the green buffer clearly shown. The provision of additional/replacement green belt means little when its development can be assigned.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1155  Respondent: 15274817 / Mike Partridge  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Objections to Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016)

I object very strongly to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016).

I wish to register strong objection to this proposed submission Local Plan primarily because it removes the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon from the Green Belt, together with sites of Wisley Airfield (A35) and Garlick’s Arch (A43). Removing the protection of the Green Belt is likely to result in unnecessary urban sprawl between Woking and Guildford. I believe there are no special circumstances which justify these villages being removed from the Green Belt.

I also object to the Local Plan because I believe that the proposed additional 13,860 new houses is not sustainable. The local communities of Ripley, Send and Clandon don’t need these houses and the Wisley Airfield (A35) and Garlick’s Arch (A43) sites have no infrastructure, no railway stations and inadequate bus services. This development would result in large numbers of extra cars and car journeys in these areas. This, coupled with the narrow rural roads and no pavements is likely to make the lives of many local residents a misery.

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch which would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have operated successfully there for some considerable time employing local people.

The proposed Local Plan lacks provision for satisfactory improvements to infrastructure for the sites (Policy 11). Local services and utilities are already near to, or at, capacity and there is no provision to improve Clinics and other key public services to cope with the huge increase in houses.

I object to the Local Plan because of the substantial increase in traffic that is likely on the trunk roads i.e. A3/M25. I understand that Highways England have no plans to even start to consider improving the A3 before 2020.

For these reasons, I believe that the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

I’m commenting from outside the immediate area affected by the Local Plan because I feel strongly that these proposed developments will not only result in considerably increased overcrowding of the commuter services into London, which are already close to capacity during peak hours, but also to the loss of quality open areas, with public access, in this part of Surrey.

I wish these objections to be fully taken into consideration and urge you to amend the Local Plan accordingly.

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

Attached documents:
I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to planning site allocation A46. The reasons for my objection to this specific allocation are that I know this site well as I live in very close proximity to it and the arguments put forward to the development by Guildford Borough Council are erroneous. I am sure that you will have received a good number of objections to this application, as the grounds for the application are erroneous in many ways, but I wish to add my comments that the application is absolutely wrong in stating that an additional school is required in the area. I am involved in local education (albeit at higher level, but I am knowledgeable with regard to secondary education) and I know for a fact that local schools are currently facing an UNDERSUBSCRIPTION for several years into the future. An additional school in the area of application A46 is absolutely not required.

I also wish to object most strongly on the grounds of sustainability and sensitivity. I am aware that Guildford Borough Council is currently supporting work at the University of Surrey's Centre for Environmental Strategy (CES) (which is an internationally acclaimed centre of excellence in sustainable development) and that this proposal (Application A46) is in direct conflict with the findings, so far, of this work. To precis a substantial volume of work (by professionals who are much more capable than I) in sustainable, energy/social/transport development, the development needs to grow organically, not be developed by the plans of a developer (which A46 is clearly is).

I understand and support the need for development of affordable housing, to support the needs of a developing Guildford. However, Guildford Borough Council is, in Application A46, proposing an unsustainable encroachment on the green belt, driven by an ill-considered plan by a developer. Guildford Borough Council, by proposing Application A46, is losing the opportunity to develop a sustainable and sensitive development that could benefit the local community and deliver a good number of affordable houses if planned sensitively and in keeping with the local environment and geography (which is subject to flooding).

There are several other factors which render this Application inadmissible, including that it fails to meet the National Planning Policy Framework, it is a threat to the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area and the local traffic infrastructure cannot cope with the current traffic density. The latter point is a current issue of contention in that traffic through Normandy is already taxing the capacity of the road infrastructure. The proposed application A46, proposing 1100 new homes, will completely overwhelm the road system, which CANNOT be improved due to the critical limitations of the bridges on Westwood Lane (road goes under railway) and Glaziers Lane (road goes over railway). A consideration of funding for improving these bridges has been included in Application A46, but this is woefully and very considerably inadequate. As a professional engineer I am conversant with the cost of bridge improvement and I know that the value considered for such improvement in Application A46 is only a tiny fraction of the sum that would be needed to enhance the throughput of either/both of these bridges.

In short, the proposal in Application A46 is not sustainable, goes against the requirements of sensitivity and cannot be cost effective. If actioned it will degrade the lives of current inhabitants of Normandy and will create poor living conditions for any eventual residents of the development. It will degrade the green belt, which will never be able to be recovered. It goes against the findings of world class research currently funded by Guildford Borough Council at the University of Surrey. I object most strongly to this development.

Regards

Prof Bryn James

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

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

I object to A43 and A43A,

This planning is not needed, building additional slip roads to the A3 would be a horrendous destruction of Ripley village. The traffic is already difficult and you are encouraging more cars, more pollution and more traffic. This village would no longer be a village.

You can not build on the Greenbelt you even have policy's stating your protection of the Greenbelt and yet you think it is okay to suddenly put forward planning?

This site has PROTECTED woodland, antient woodland with tress for the 16th century.

Please give up on this plan and go and build on brown site areas, we do not need additional houses, our schools, doctors, roads are already too busy

Listen to the current residents of these villages and work along side them not against them please.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1157  Respondent: 15275073 / Sean Lightfoote  Agent:

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

I object to Site Allocation A43 - This is an entirely new development with no exceptional circumstances being built on Green Belt land. The site is protected under the NPPF and there is no excuse to build properties here. It is a conservation space with ancient woodlands. On top of the destruction of beautiful natural space you would be destroying the homes of some of our wildlife including rabbit warrens, bats roosts and badgers sets.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1158  Respondent: 15275073 / Sean Lightfoote  Agent:

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

I object to Site Allocation A43a as you would effectively turn Send into a motorway linking the M25 to Woking. Send's infrastructure cannot take this level of through traffic past our local schools and surgery. It would create chaos and make the local road dangerously busy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1159  Respondent: 15275073 / Sean Lightfoote  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( No ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( No ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( No )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Site Allocation A44 as this is a new site that's not in the Regulation 18 draft. It's also not been included in previous consultations. This land is green belt, and a site that's unsafe to be build on. This was a former land fill site which is currently vented. As a public area it's beautiful countryside for properties it would be unsafe. It's serviced by a small road which would not be sufficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1161  Respondent: 15275137 / Lewis Crane  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( No ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( Yes )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The scale of the A25 development is far too great and would require significant infrastructure improvements for it to be viable. I believe it would require it's own junction with the A3, doctors, rail station, dentist, primary and secondary school etc. It is likely to present significant impact to the residents of Burpham and Merrow due to it's close proximity to each of these communities. In addition, the development threatens the rural nature of this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A35 seems to make more sense as one of the larger housing schemes given that the site is formerly commercial and is derelict. I also feel that this area would benefit more from the investment in terms of new schools, commercial areas, etc and would not create such a congested and sprawling community so close to Guildford as would be created by developing A25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1171  Respondent: 15276737 / Alessia Gualandris  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( Yes ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( Yes )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very concerned about the proposal of a new burial ground (especially a crematorium) in area A23 on the north of Salt Box Road, very close to a largely populated area, especially the Queen Elizabeth Park.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It's very well known and scientifically documented that this would release a lot of mercury and toxins in the air, so a crematorium should never be built in close to a residential area. If deemed necessary, a crematorium should be built in a remote location, far from houses and families.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7969  **Respondent:** 15278369 / Ripley Parish Council (Jim Morris)  **Agent:**

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

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


The Report identifies and comments on the policies in the PSLP, in particular those affecting the Parish of Ripley and its community and sets out the RPC’s reasoned objections to the PSLP.

In particular the Parish Council objects to the following proposed allocations and policies in the Plan:

- Site allocation Policy A43 Land at Garlick’s Arch
- Site Allocation Policy A43a Land for new north facing slip roads to/from A3 at Send Marsh/Burnt Common
- Site Allocation Policy A45: Land at rear of the Talbot, Ripley
- Site Allocation Policy A57: The Paddocks, Rose Lane Ripley
- The following Site Allocation Policies:
  - A25 Gosden Hill Farm
  - A35 Land at former Wisley Airfield, Ockham
  - A36 Hotel Guildford Road East Horsley
  - A37 Land at Bell and Colvill, West Horsley
  - A38 Land at West Horsley
  - A39 Land near Horsley Station, West Horsley
  - A40 Land to the north of West Horsley
  - A41 Land to the south of West Horsley
  - Green Belt insetting; in particular:
    - (a) Insetting of Ripley Village
    - (b) Insetting of HMP Send
    - (c) General insetting of Green Belt settlements

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1225  **Respondent:** 15279329 / Bonnar Allan  **Agent:**

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

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( Yes )
1. Proposed site allocation A46 (Land to the south of Normandy and north of Flexford) should be deleted from the Plan.

2. Land at Harper's Road/ Wyke Lane should be allocated in the emerging Plan for housing-led, mixed use development (please see attached representation for more details).

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

Attached documents:  
160714 updated redline plan.pdf (645 KB)  
160718 Bonnar Allan Regulation 19 representation to Guildford BC July 2016.pdf (440 KB)

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1221  
Respondent: 15280321 / Sport England (Owen Neal)  
Agent:

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

It is Sport England’s policy to resist proposals which will result in the loss of a playing field, unless it meets one of five exceptions as defined in A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England, see: https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/development-management/planning-applications/playing-field-land/

Sport England’s policy is supported by paragraph 74 of the Government’s National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Both Sport England’s policy and paragraph 74 also support the protection and retention of other sports facilities. In light of this, Sport England’s main consideration in relation to site allocations is to seek to protect existing playing field stock and sports facilities being lost to development. Please note that if any such sites are being considered for inclusion within the Plan, please could the Council consider their allocation within the context of our Policies referenced above

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7871  
Respondent: 15280737 / Miller Developments (David Milloy)  
Agent: The Chine Consultancy Advice Ltd (David Pugh)

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction

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

In introducing the site allocations, the Plan confirms that the objective is to bring forward housing sites in the earlier stages of the plan period, to help boost housing supply. It is acknowledged also that those sites that are constrained and are identified to come forward in later years should be encouraged to come forward sooner.

Miller is challenging the spatial strategy and its over reliance on larger strategic housing allocations (those over 1000 dwellings) on the basis that they are dependent upon the provision of infrastructure, especially highway improvements, which are yet to be specified, costed or accurately programmed for delivery.

The RIS programme makes reference to ‘anticipated’ start dates and in the absence of detailed designs developers cannot assess the additional capacity these improvements will create, when they will come forward or how much they will cost. Hence developers will be wholly dependent upon the existing highways network for access; which is already near, or at its design capacity and arguably in some cases exceeds capacity. The improvements that will be of greatest benefit to the larger strategic sites are the improvements to the A3 between Guildford and the A31 Hogs Back junction and these are not ‘anticipated’ to ‘commence’ until the latter end of the plan period (post 2024). Furthermore, developers have no
detailed understanding of the proposed Sustainable Movement Corridor improvements; in particular its timing or cost. These unknowns will add uncertainty about the viability and deliverability of these major developments.

In relation to the identification of potential housing allocations the Council has had regard to a number of studies which have in turn informed the GBCS and its most recent review (Volume V).

The original study (which as originally published in 2014) ultimately identified a number of Potential Development Areas (PDAs) that could potentially be released for development, should it be necessary to release Green Belt sites in order to meet housing demands. The Study assessed the PDAs against the main purposes of the Green Belt and went on to assess their sustainability credentials and environmental capacity. The Study findings informed the Council’s Strategy & Sites document which was published for consultation in 2014 and set out the Spatial Strategy for the Borough (distribution of development sites). This version of the Plan concentrated on opportunities beyond the Green Belt to the west of the Borough; the extension of Guildford’s built up area and the countryside around villages. However, it did not include details of the Council’s highways strategy.

Subsequently, the Council commissioned an extension of the GBCS which was published in February 2016. This additional work considered whether other development opportunities might exist in areas excluded from consideration at the time of the original study, notably:

- Use countryside to expand around settlements located in adjoining boroughs;
- Use countryside to expand around settlements located in the AONB;
- Assess the potential to inset additional villages depending on the development of PDAs;
- Further assessment of Countryside beyond the Green Belt (CBGB);
- Expansion or redevelopment of previously developed sites;
- Significantly expand a village. In this regard, it is to be noted that the Council’s brief to the prospective consultant stated that:

  “An initial assessment based on previous consultation, desktop research and our settlement hierarchy suggests that areas with greatest potential include the countryside, such as land between the villages of Normandy and Flexford or Send and Send Marsh / Burnt Common *. Significantly expanding or merging villages would utilise more effectively the services and facilities that are already present there whilst at the same time be of sufficient scale to enable additional supporting infrastructure. The study should assess these and other similar opportunities across the borough.”

- Create a new village.

* Surprisingly the Council did not include the village of Fairlands in this shortlist despite it scoring better in sustainability terms than sites around Send and Normandy / Flexford. This is returned to below.

This additional GCBS volume has very much been used to justify the latest iteration of the Council’s Spatial Strategy and, in particular, the inclusion of the Wisley Airfield site and the introduction of a further strategic site at Normandy / Flexford, which (along with the other strategic sites) are considered to meet the newly introduced ‘critical mass’ criteria; an arbitrary scale of development that is deemed necessary to support the level of infrastructure necessary to support the larger sites.

This new criterion requires that, in order to represent a sustainable development, as required by the NPPF, large expansions to existing villages, or an entirely new village, should result in a settlement that benefits from:

- A mix of uses, including residential, employment, community and retail;
- A critical mass of population to support the above uses, likely to be at least 4,000;
- A significant proportion of open space (40%); and
- Connections to the wider public transport network.

Furthermore, the Council has adopted the following assumptions when assessing the credentials of competing sites:
• Residential development should make up approximately 50% of the land take area of the identified PMDA. The residential land take would be calculated on the basis of 30 dwellings per hectare with an average household size of 2.4 people to determine the population growth at the village;
• Open space should make up approximately 40% of the land take area in accordance with new settlement guidelines. This can include Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) and public open space within the PMDA; and
• Village infrastructure such as roads and attenuation ponds together with other additional facilities including employment and a local centre with shops, food and drink outlets, primary school and nursery, would make up approximately 10% of the land take area depending on which facilities are applicable to the major expansion. If the village expansion does not include certain facilities due to scale, other uses such as housing may have increased capacity within the PMDA.

Whilst these criteria may well have been derived from a successful development elsewhere in the country, Miller considers that the characteristics of Guildford Borough and the development constraints that exist do not warrant such a prescriptive approach to assessing the development potential of major sites. To the contrary, it seems to be a post-justification of the Council’s strategy to concentrate the majority of it housing requirements on a limited number of large sites and avoid sensitive decisions that would surround a greater number of smaller Green Belt releases; despite the fact that such sites would place less of a burden on infrastructure during the early periods of the plan if properly distributed.

We therefore believe that the Guildford Borough would be far better served by a more flexible approach that enabled a greater number of modestly sized sites, properly distributed across the borough – on a scale that was put forward in earlier iterations of the Local Plan. Whilst some of the strategic sites have their attributes, they can only realistically be partially developed during the Plan period (subject to wider infrastructure provision), so alternatives do need to be developed. This is particularly the case when taking into account the widespread concerns about the Normandy / Flexford site (and the doubts over whether the proposed secondary school is actually needed) and the likely AONB restrictions in relation to the Blackwell Farm site.

Miller’s concerns are exacerbated by the Council’s conclusion that:

‘No major village expansions were considered appropriate within the surroundings of Chilworth, East Horsley, Fairlands, Pirbright, Ripley, Shalford and Wood Street Village due to a combination of environmental constraints, limited sustainability credentials, and the potential impact on the purposes and openness of the Green Belt within Guildford Borough’ and, as a consequence, deleted the references to any PDAs / Safeguarded land in these locations.’

This conclusion is entirely inconsistent with the original findings of the GBCS which concluded that, for example, H8-C was a highly sustainable location and could be developed without compromising the purposes of the Green Belt. The Council has provided no justification for the U-turn.

In light of Miller’s concerns it is considered that the Plan should identify a number of more modestly sized sites (such as H8-C) across the borough as a whole, as an alternative and/or in addition to relying almost exclusively on the larger allocations.

Whilst some of the strategic sites clearly have their attributes, they can only realistically be partially developed during the Plan period, so others sit will need to come forward, especially given our concerns about Normandy and Blackwell Farm – as we go on to outline in more detail in our specific concerns about these allocations.

In this context, Miller is particularly concerned about the Council’s failure to properly review the potential of the site H8-C in the most recent review of the GBCS; a site which is considered to represent a highly sustainable opportunity adjacent to an existing village. This concern is heightened by the fact that H8-C is considered to be far more sustainable that the newly allocated PDA at Normandy / Flexford and shares many characteristics considered to justify the allocation.

Overall, Miller considers that:

• Too great an emphasis has been attached on the conclusion reached that Parcel H8 is of ‘High Sensitivity’ in Green Belt terms. This is a large land parcel which includes Fairlands village to the north east and Wood Street
Village to the South West. The area between comprises agricultural land which is crossed by numerous tree lined public rights of way and is characterised by well-established tree belts that define field boundaries, meaning that the majority of it is not even being considered for development, nor would ever be likely to be so. The original GBCS concluded that these defensible boundaries supported the development potential of PDA H8 (which is a much smaller area to the area H8) ‘without compromising the purposes of the Green Belt’.

- In summary, it was considered that Fairlands could be ‘inset’ as the village contributed little to the openness of the Green Belt and that the PDA could effectively be removed from the Green Belt without compromise to its purpose (with the purpose being maintained by the significant remainder of the H8 area). In other words, it was felt that the ‘openness’ of the area would be maintained by developing within the well-defined field boundaries and that the gap between Fairlands and Wood Street would be maintained thus preventing the settlements form merging. The maintenance of this gap would also preserve the setting of Wood Street (a historic village and Conservation Area) which lies some distance to the south west.

- Too little weight has been applied to the sustainability credentials of the land adjoining Fairlands which scored highly in the original GBCS; especially in respect of H8-C (our site). As confirmed in the recently published Volume V to the GBCS the PDAs for Fairlands came 6th in the overall Sustainability Rankings (with parcel H8-C ranking particularly highly) which compares equally, if not better, to the assessments for Send (5th in the Sustainability Rankings), Send Marsh / Burntwood Common (20th) and Normandy / Flexford (10th); all of which the Council has now concluded can be brought forward for development.

Accordingly, there seems to be no reasoned justification why Fairlands should not also be considered as an appropriate location for development as has been consistently maintained by Miller in relation to H8-C in circumstances where the site:

1. Would provide for a level of development that respects the character of – and be subservient to – the existing village.
2. It would not necessitate access through the village which is already constrained by the narrow road layout, on street parking, the left in left out access junction on the A322 and the school traffic that causes congestion during the AM and PM peak periods.
3. The site would provide access to the school from the south which would remove school traffic from the village, particularly as the school continues to expand its pupil numbers over the coming years.
4. The new access would provide safe pedestrian and cycle routes and highway improvements to the A322 including a new pedestrian crossing to enhance access to the school, in line with the objectives of the recently approved School Travel Plan.
5. The scale of development can be accommodated with improvements to the foul sewers, an upgrade of the electrical power and the new access. These improvements are of a level that would not constrain the ability to deliver a policy compliant level of affordable housing.
6. Any minor loss of common land can be compensated for and the development can provide on-site public amenity space which links via existing and proposed footpaths to the immediately adjacent common.
7. The purposes for designating the Green Belt would be largely unharmed as the site is well screened by existing mature tree and hedgerow boundaries that will preserve the openness of the wider Green Belt. For the reasons set out above the other purposes of the Green Belt would be maintained.

In shaping the proposals, Miller has engaged with the local councillors, the Parish Council, the school community and local residents to identify how a development at Hook Farm / Hunts Farm could most effectively complement the local area. Given the considerable emphasis that has been placed on justifying the need for the strategic allocation at Normandy / Flexford based on the supposed need for a new secondary school in that location, we consider that the actual need in relation to an existing primary school for a long-term access solution should be given significant weight in deciding whether the land at Hook Farm / Hunts Farm is allocated to enable this. To support the case for this, and to expand on the points set out above, we are appended to this submission a number of documents, including a:

- Submission by Miller Developments in relation to Worplesdon Primary School’s Travel Plan (which although now approved has no deliverable actions to address the issues relating to increasing school traffic).
- Letter from the Headteacher of Worplesdon Primary School to parents setting out that the School welcomes our initiative in offering a proper solution to the traffic and parking issues faced on a daily basis.
During March, we undertook a series of consultation sessions with parents and local residents, at which the attached presentation boards outlining Miller’s proposals for the land at Hook Farm / Hunts Farm. These boards provide further details of the unique benefits arising from a residential development in this location, and how key issues would be addressed.

The consultation feedback can be summarised as follows:

**Parents:**

- Strong preference for improved access arrangements to Primary School, as well as a safer crossing across Aldershot Road.
- Support for pathway footpath between the School and Wood Street Village which would be drained and capable of use all year round; with an indication given that more parents would walk / cycle their children to school.
- Recognition that existing access to the School causes problems for local residents and they would like to see an alternative in place which does not involve passing through Fairlands Village.
- Concern as to whether the proposed car park is large enough; request for a larger number of spaces to be provided.
- Recognition that additional housing is needed in the local area, with this location considered preferential due to wider benefits it brings.

**Public – general feedback:**

- Overwhelming recognition of the need for additional housing in Guildford Borough.
- Mixed views on Guildford Borough Council’s stance that some Green Belt land must be released for development.
- Strong preference for Hook Farm / Hunts Farm instead of the then safeguarded land to west of Fairlands (H8A & B).
- Strong support for proposed new access road, safe crossing and pathway to Primary School.
- Mixed views about the proposed use of Common Land for the new access road, with a strong desire to see lost land re-provided.
- With regard to a number of technical issues which were also raised, these would be addressed at the application stage.

Like many other sites around the Borough, vehicular access would be enabled through the creation of a new road across publicly-owned land – in this instance Common Land between the A323 and the development site. Miller is currently engaged in a constructive dialogue with Surrey County Council’s Estates Department about the purchase of the necessary land for widening the existing access, with any minor areas of Common Land lost being reprovided in full.

For the above reasons Miller maintains that Site H8-C (which comprises of land at Hook Farm / Hunts Farm) should be allocated for development which would ensure housing coming forward during the early part of the Plan period and reduce the risks associated with relying on the larger housing allocations which are infrastructure dependent which could affect their viability and delivery.

As outlined above, Miller does not support the assumption that to be sustainable village expansion or any new settlement must have a population of 4000. A development with a population of around 550-600 is clearly sustainable (and on a scale that is more in keeping with the character of most of the Borough) given that significantly smaller developments have been allocated within the plan.

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

Attached documents:

- [15057_Boards_FINAL_LR.pdf](#) (9.6 MB)
- [Submission by Miller Developments on SCC Ref 2016-0005 - Worplesdon Primary School Travel Plan - final.pdf](#) (486 KB)
- [Letter from Headteacher of Worplesdon Primary School - Miller Developments.docx](#) (1.3 MB)
Comment ID: PSLPS16/1243  Respondent: 15282529 / Elizabeth Owen  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction

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

I object to the removal of the villages of Chilworth, Shalford and Peasmarsh from the Green Belt. It is vital for the well-being of our citizens that they should live in pleasant open surroundings with access to the countryside.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1244  Respondent: 15282753 / Michael Meanley  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction

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

I wish to object to the removal of the Greenbelt status around the villages including West Horsley due to its piecemeal redevelopment nature.

The sites do not properly provide for sustainable redevelopment and the removal of Greenbelt removes farm land.

To remove the Horsleys from the Greenbelt exceptional circumstances need to be provided this has not been done

No sound reasons have been provided to extend the boundaries.

I do accept and support where it can be proved sustainable and developers pay for infrastructure, schools, transport upgrades that new villages such as Wisley, and Gosden Hill Farm be allowed, these settlements must be over 1500 units and sustainable (no drain on existing services) within their own right and developers pay a 10 year service charge on account to ensure doctors surgeries, buses and schools, sewage systems etc are maintained.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1245  Respondent: 15282881 / Peter Palmer  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction

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

A46 is too much!

It's turning Normandy from a village into a town, and sacrificing too much precious green belt.

We do need affordable houses for first time buyers so I'm in favour of enlarging the village housing stock by 10%.

But this proposal is simply an imposition too far.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1267  **Respondent:** 15283073 / Natasha France  **Agent:**

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

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

I object to the proposed sites at A43, a43a and A35.

Site A35 is totally unsustainable - it is totally car dependant, needs and relies upon outside funding for up grading of junction 10 and also requires site A43 to pay for the junction improvements at A43a so that the traffic impact that it will create is mitigated. A43 is not a good site in its own right it is proposed simply to mitigate the traffic impact of site a35. It is surley plain stupid to allow circa 5000 units to be developed with approximately 3 miles of each other all relying upon A3 improvements!

 Guildford and a lot of the south east relie upon the A3. Why are we also placing so much pressure on it (the a3) to also make housing acceptable.

So much of this plan relies upon the A3 working and being paid for by central government. It is not a credible 5 yr plan. I object.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1262  **Respondent:** 15283137 / Andrew Tate  **Agent:**

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

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

The Hogs Back is a wonderful resource for local people and forms part of London’s Green belt.

Site A26 Blackwell Farm is set to change this and puts under threat the sanctity of the Hogs Back with the massive housing development threatened here. It will be so visible from the top of the Hogs Back when walking, riding, cycling or even in a car as you look north. Presently there is a green lung separating this lovely area from the development associated with Aldershot, Camberley, Woking (all visible in the distance).

Build on brownfield sites first - that should be the policy not over 3,000 houses on this AONB.

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

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1371</th>
<th>Respondent: 15299425 / Tim and June Yorath</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SITES - POLICIES A1 TO A57**

Each of these objections relates to each of the sites in the Green Belt.

We object to the identification and allocation of sites in this plan without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other constraints. The plan says that “allocating these sites does not grant planning permission for development.” However, each of the sites will be removed from the Green Belt and will be available in principle for development and non-Green Belt uses. The inclusion of these sites without detailed site by site justification shows contempt for the thousands of detailed comments the Council have received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. The plan has hardly changed since the Council received 20,000 objections to its first draft plan in 2014. The Inspector considering the plan may conclude that the consultation has not been properly conducted.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1425</th>
<th>Respondent: 15314817 / Mr and Mrs Daniels</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) **WE OBJECT TO** the overdevelopment of Garlicks Arch, Burnt Common/Clandon, The Talbot, Gosden Hill farm and Wisley Airfield, to name but a few....The development is totally inappropriate and unsustainable in the Green Belt.

3) **WE MOST DEFINITELY OBJECT TO** the Traveller Pitches, we have gone through all this before, when they all decided to take over the land at the back of our houses. They do not follow the rules or pay the correct bills, so why should they be given land to live on.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1519</th>
<th>Respondent: 15327905 / Julia Cook</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SITES1. Green Belt sites

I OBJECT to the identification and allocation of sites in this plan without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other constraints. The plan says that “allocating these sites does not grant planning permission for development; however, it does identify the principle of development and uses.” This ignores the tens of thousands of detailed comments the Council have received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. This amounts to a war of attrition by the Council in conjunction with developers, since many busy residents are sick and tired of repeating
the same comments to deaf ears. The plan has hardly changed since the Council received 20,000 objections to its first draft plan in 2014. Some residents have concluded that commenting is a waste of time.

All Green Belt sites should be removed from the plan until “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/160  Respondent: 15377953 / cctvtraining.com ltd (Gordon Tyerman)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Introduction

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

There are more Traveller sites in the plan than identified in the research carried out using the national traveller policies.

Paragraphs 86 of the plan has been ignored in Ash and Tongham which are being developed in such as way that there will be no demarcation between the two villages. Villages should be able to show green belt areas between them is protected. This huge development does not follow that government advice.

There are NO special circumstances that require Ash and Tongham to be developed in this way. (paras 89/90) There is NO protection for the small villages Ash and Tongham which does not meet the governments national strategy on housebuilding. (Non merger para 80)

Given there has been massive development in Ash and Tongham already, outside of this plan further massive development would create an imbalance of housing to local amenities. There are no school places for such a large growth in housing and subsequent student population. Ash and Tongham should be protected from further massive development.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3216  Respondent: 15442049 / Ellouise Fassom  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction

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

I OBJECT to all strategic sites proposed in the draft Plan to be built in the Green Belt.

1. I object to the identification and allocation of sites in this plan without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other constraints. The plan says that “allocating these sites does not grant planning permission for development.” However, each of the sites will be removed from the Green Belt and will be available in principle for development and non-Green Belt uses. The inclusion of these sites without detailed site by site justification shows contempt for the thousands of detailed comments the Council have received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. The plan has hardly changed since the Council received 20,000 objections to its first draft plan in 2014. The Inspector considering the plan may conclude that the consultation has not been properly conducted.
2. The housing needs assessment is flawed in various respects and overstates housing need. In addition since it was produced, the referendum Brexit decision has almost certainly reduced future housing need and rendered the previous assessment seriously out of date. As a result any assessment of Green Belt sites which took place to consider whether “exceptional circumstances” existed to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt was based on false premises and should be reconsidered.

3. Having determined housing need the Council was entitled to consider constraints before determining the housing number. I believe that as Ill as being entitled to do this the Council was required to give proper consideration to constraints. The scarcity of sites outside the Green Belt as Ill as infrastructure (most notable roads) considerations all represented constraints which should have been taken into account in determining the final housing number. Accordingly in this regard our objection to the allocation of Green Belt sites is twofold. First I believe constraints should have been applied. Secondly I believe the Council did not properly consider constraints and that their decision making process was flawed and thus subject to being set aside by the Inspector.

Even if having properly applied constraints there is a need to develop in the Green Belt then specific Green Belt sites should not be included in the plan unless “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven in relation to that specific site, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established. There needs to be a specific balancing exercise conducted on each Green Belt site weighing the harm to the Green Belt against the very special circumstances which are argued in favour of development at that particular site. There is no evidence this has been done. Instead the council have appeared to say that having chosen a housing needs figure and decided it cannot be met without building on Green Belt then there is no need for any further consideration and any convenient Green Belt site can be allocated for building at will.

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

Attached documents:

I OBJECT to all strategic sites proposed in the draft Plan to be built in the Green Belt.

1. I object to the identification and allocation of sites in this plan without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other constraints. The plan says that “allocating these sites does not grant planning permission for development.” However, each of the sites will be removed from the Green Belt and will be available in principle for development and non-Green Belt uses. The inclusion of these sites without detailed site by site justification shows contempt for the thousands of detailed comments the Council have received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. The plan has hardly changed since the Council received 20,000 objections to its first draft plan in 2014. The Inspector considering the plan may conclude that the consultation has not been properly conducted.

2. The housing needs assessment is flawed in various respects and overstates housing need. In addition since it was produced, the referendum Brexit decision has almost certainly reduced future housing need and rendered the previous assessment seriously out of date. As a result any assessment of Green Belt sites which took place to consider whether “exceptional circumstances” existed to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt was based on false premises and should be reconsidered.

3. Having determined housing need the Council was entitled to consider constraints before determining the housing number. I believe that as Ill as being entitled to do this the Council was required to give proper consideration to constraints. The scarcity of sites outside the Green Belt as Ill as infrastructure (most notable roads) considerations all represented constraints which should have been taken into account in determining the final housing number. Accordingly in this regard our objection to the allocation of Green Belt sites is twofold. First I believe constraints should have been applied. Secondly I believe the Council did not properly consider
constraints and that their decision making process was flawed and thus subject to being set aside by the Inspector.

Even if having properly applied constraints there is a need to develop in the Green Belt then specific Green Belt sites should not be included in the plan unless “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven in relation to that specific site, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established. There needs to be a specific balancing exercise conducted on each Green Belt site weighing the harm to the Green Belt against the very special circumstances which are argued in favour of development at that particular site. There is no evidence this has been done. Instead the council have appeared to say that having chosen a housing needs figure and decided it cannot be met without building on Green Belt then there is no need for any further consideration and any convenient Green Belt site can be allocated for building at will.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3246</th>
<th>Respondent: 15442913 / Inger Scotland</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. SITES - POLICIES A1 TO A57

I OBJECT to all strategic sites proposed in the draft Plan to be built in the Green Belt.

1. I object to the identification and allocation of sites in this plan without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other The plan says that “allocating these sites does not grant planning permission for development.” However, each of the sites will be removed from the Green Belt and will be available in principle for development and non-Green Belt uses. The inclusion of these sites without detailed site by site justification shows contempt for the thousands of detailed comments the Council have received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. The plan has hardly changed since the Council received 20,000 objections to its first draft plan in 2014. The Inspector considering the plan may conclude that the consultation has not been properly conducted.

2. The housing needs assessment is flawed in various respects and overstates housing. In addition since it was produced, the referendum Brexit decision has almost certainly reduced future housing need and rendered the previous assessment seriously out of date. As a result any assessment of Green Belt sites which took place to consider whether “exceptional circumstances” existed to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt was based on false premises and should be reconsidered.

3. Having determined housing need the Council was entitled to consider constraints before determining the housing I believe that as well as being entitled to do this the Council was required to give proper consideration to constraints. The scarcity of sites outside the Green Belt as well as infrastructure (most notable roads) considerations all represented constraints which should have been taken into account in determining the final housing number. Accordingly in this regard our objection to the allocation of Green Belt sites is twofold. First I believe constraints should have been applied. Secondly I believe the Council did not properly consider constraints and that their decision making process was flawed and thus subject to being set aside by the Inspector.

4. Even if having properly applied constraints there is a need to develop in the Green Belt then specific Green Belt sites should not be included in the Plan unless “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven in relation to that specific site, as stipulated repeatedly in the The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established. There needs to be a specific balancing exercise conducted on each Green Belt site weighing the harm to the Green Belt against the very special circumstances which are argued in favour of development at that particular site. There is no evidence this has been done. Instead the council have appeared to say that having chosen a housing needs figure and decided it
cannot be met without building on Green Belt then there is no need for any further consideration and any convenient Green Belt site can be allocated for building at will.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6753</th>
<th>Respondent: 15446401 / Louise Yandle</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

I OBJECT TO ALL POLICIES INVOLVING BUILDING IN THE GREEN BELT:
- No “exceptional circumstances” shown, numbers excessive and the clearly expressed views of residents in previous consultations ignored.

I OBJECT ESPECIALLY TO 6 POLICIES: A36, A37, A38, A39, A40 & A41:
- Amount of new housing far exceeds local need.
- Housing density excessive when compared with existing development.
- Would transform the Horsleys into a sizable town, something for which no case is made.
- No local support.
- Collective impact of these 6 sites on a small part of the borough not considered. Should not be treated as isolated, separate sites.
- Total amount of new building out of scale with the planned development elsewhere the borough, especially less sensitive urban areas not protected by Green Belt.
- Sites unsustainable. Key infrastructure lacking. No adequate provision is made to increase it – e.g. poor wastewater capacity, lack of schools, absence of traffic management plan, flooding.
- No account taken of additional impact of Wisley Airfield site on Horsleys.
- Extension of settlement boundaries too permissive. Horsleys characterised by streets with development along only one side of the road. Policies allow too many adjacent green fields to be developed by squaring off boundaries and claiming they don’t contribute to Green Belt “openness”.
- Green Belt gap with neighbouring settlements hugely narrowed, especially if Wisley Airfield is built on.
- Will harm compliance with NPPF 81 – e.g. by making cycling (including Prudential cycle races) too dangerous, ruining the rural setting of Waterloo Farm campsite, destroying the ambience of Grange Park Opera’s new “Theatre in the Woods”.
- Policy A40 especially unviable because of high water table and poor drainage, leading to regular winter flooding.
- Safe access and egress at Site A40 unachievable, owing to flooding, high speed limits, poor sight lines, narrow access to existing properties, inadequate pavements for elderly and schoolchildren, increasing use by recreational cyclists etc.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3311</th>
<th>Respondent: 15447585 / Lionel and Maureen Wilson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

I strongly object to Policy Numbers A27’A28,A29,A46 because of loss of countryside in Ash and Tongham loss of green belt in Normandy, more congestion not enough parking facilities at local shops more demand for services at doctors and hospitals.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3358  Respondent: 15448321 / Nicole Mapplebeck  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to all strategic sites proposed in the draft Plan to be built in the Green Belt.

1. I object to the identification and allocation of sites in this plan without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other constraints. The plan says that “allocating these sites does not grant planning permission for development.” However, each of the sites will be removed from the Green Belt and will be available in principle for development and non-Green Belt uses. The inclusion of these sites without detailed site by site justification shows contempt for the thousands of detailed comments the Council have received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. The plan has hardly changed since the Council received 20,000 objections to its first draft plan in 2014. The Inspector considering the plan may conclude that the consultation has not been properly conducted.

2. The housing needs assessment is flawed in various respects and overstates housing need. In addition since it was produced, the referendum Brexit decision has almost certainly reduced future housing need and rendered the previous assessment seriously out of date. As a result any assessment of Green Belt sites which took place to consider whether “exceptional circumstances” existed to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt was based on false premises and should be reconsidered.

3. Having determined housing need the Council was entitled to consider constraints before determining the housing number. I believe that as Ill as being entitled to do this the Council was required to give proper consideration to constraints. The scarcity of sites outside the Green Belt as Ill as infrastructure (most notable roads) considerations all represented constraints which should have been taken into account in determining the final housing number. Accordingly in this regard our objection to the allocation of Green Belt sites is twofold. First I believe constraints should have been applied. Secondly I believe the Council did not properly consider constraints and that their decision making process was flawed and thus subject to being set aside by the Inspector.

Even if having properly applied constraints there is a need to develop in the Green Belt then specific Green Belt sites should not be included in the plan unless “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven in relation to that specific site, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established. There needs to be a specific balancing exercise conducted on each Green Belt site weighing the harm to the Green Belt against the very special circumstances which are argued in favour of development at that particular site. There is no evidence this has been done. Instead the council have appeared to say that having chosen a housing needs figure and decided it cannot be met without building on Green Belt then there is no need for any further consideration and any convenient Green Belt site can be allocated for building at will.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3359  Respondent: 15448353 / Emily Roberts  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to all strategic sites proposed in the draft Plan to be built in the Green Belt.

1. I object to the identification and allocation of sites in this plan without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other constraints. The plan says that "allocating these sites does not grant planning permission for development." However, each of the sites will be removed from the Green Belt and will be available in principle for development and non-Green Belt uses. The inclusion of these sites without detailed site by site justification shows contempt for the thousands of detailed comments the Council have received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. The plan has hardly changed since the Council received 20,000 objections to its first draft plan in 2014. The Inspector considering the plan may conclude that the consultation has not been properly conducted.

2. The housing needs assessment is flawed in various respects and overstates housing need. In addition since it was produced, the referendum Brexit decision has almost certainly reduced future housing need and rendered the previous assessment seriously out of date. As a result any assessment of Green Belt sites which took place to consider whether "exceptional circumstances" existed to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt was based on false premises and should be reconsidered.

3. Having determined housing need the Council was entitled to consider constraints before determining the housing number. I believe that as Ill as being entitled to do this the Council was required to give proper consideration to constraints. The scarcity of sites outside the Green Belt as Ill as infrastructure (most notable roads) considerations all represented constraints which should have been taken into account in determining the final housing number. Accordingly in this regard our objection to the allocation of Green Belt sites is twofold. First I believe constraints should have been applied. Secondly I believe the Council did not properly consider constraints and that their decision making process was flawed and thus subject to being set aside by the Inspector.

Even if having properly applied constraints there is a need to develop in the Green Belt then specific Green Belt sites should not be included in the plan unless "exceptional circumstances" for development are proven in relation to that specific site, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established. There needs to be a specific balancing exercise conducted on each Green Belt site weighing the harm to the Green Belt against the very special circumstances which are argued in favour of development at that particular site. There is no evidence this has been done. Instead the council have appeared to say that having chosen a housing needs figure and decided it cannot be met without building on Green Belt then there is no need for any further consideration and any convenient Green Belt site can be allocated for building at will.

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

Attached documents:
2. The housing needs assessment is flawed in various respects and overstates housing need. In addition since it was produced, the referendum Brexit decision has almost certainly reduced future housing need and rendered the previous assessment seriously out of date. As a result any assessment of Green Belt sites which took place to consider whether “exceptional circumstances” existed to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt was based on false premises and should be reconsidered.

3. Having determined housing need the Council was entitled to consider constraints before determining the housing number. I believe that as ill as being entitled to do this the Council was required to give proper consideration to constraints. The scarcity of sites outside the Green Belt as ill as infrastructure (most notable roads) considerations all represented constraints which should have been taken into account in determining the final housing number. Accordingly in this regard our objection to the allocation of Green Belt sites is twofold. First I believe constraints should have been applied. Secondly I believe the Council did not properly consider constraints and that their decision making process was flawed and thus subject to being set aside by the Inspector.

Even if having properly applied constraints there is a need to develop in the Green Belt then specific Green Belt sites should not be included in the plan unless “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven in relation to that specific site, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established. There needs to be a specific balancing exercise conducted on each Green Belt site weighing the harm to the Green Belt against the very special circumstances which are argued in favour of development at that particular site. There is no evidence this has been done. Instead the council have appeared to say that having chosen a housing needs figure and decided it cannot be met without building on Green Belt then there is no need for any further consideration and any convenient Green Belt site can be allocated for building at will.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3362  Respondent: 15448449 / Carol Roberts  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction

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

I OBJECT to all strategic sites proposed in the draft Plan to be built in the Green Belt.

1. I object to the identification and allocation of sites in this plan without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other constraints. The plan says that “allocating these sites does not grant planning permission for development.” However, each of the sites will be removed from the Green Belt and will be available in principle for development and non-Green Belt uses. The inclusion of these sites without detailed site by site justification shows contempt for the thousands of detailed comments the Council have received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. The plan has hardly changed since the Council received 20,000 objections to its first draft plan in 2014. The Inspector considering the plan may conclude that the consultation has not been properly conducted.

2. The housing needs assessment is flawed in various respects and overstates housing need. In addition since it was produced, the referendum Brexit decision has almost certainly reduced future housing need and rendered the previous assessment seriously out of date. As a result any assessment of Green Belt sites which took place to consider whether “exceptional circumstances” existed to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt was based on false premises and should be reconsidered.

3. Having determined housing need the Council was entitled to consider constraints before determining the housing number. I believe that as ill as being entitled to do this the Council was required to give proper consideration to constraints. The scarcity of sites outside the Green Belt as ill as infrastructure (most notable roads) considerations all represented constraints which should have been taken into account in determining the final housing number. Accordingly in this regard our objection to the allocation of Green Belt sites is twofold. First I believe constraints should have been applied. Secondly I believe the Council did not properly consider
constraints and that their decision making process was flawed and thus subject to being set aside by the Inspector.

Even if having properly applied constraints there is a need to develop in the Green Belt then specific Green Belt sites should not be included in the plan unless “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven in relation to that specific site, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established. There needs to be a specific balancing exercise conducted on each Green Belt site weighing the harm to the Green Belt against the very special circumstances which are argued in favour of development at that particular site. There is no evidence this has been done. Instead the council have appeared to say that having chosen a housing needs figure and decided it cannot be met without building on Green Belt then there is no need for any further consideration and any convenient Green Belt site can be allocated for building at will.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3702</th>
<th>Respondent: 15457537 / Surrey Gypsy Traveller Communities Forum (Ann Wilson)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agent:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**SITES**

In principle, the SGTCF support the provision of Gypsy and Traveller pitches in the following locations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A48</th>
<th>Land at Home Farm, Effingham</th>
<th>Effingham</th>
<th>Traveller pitches (sui generis)</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A49</td>
<td>Palm House Nurseries, Normandy</td>
<td>Normandy</td>
<td>Traveller pitches (sui generis)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A50</td>
<td>Whittles Drive, Normandy</td>
<td>Normandy</td>
<td>Travelling Showpeople plots</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A51</td>
<td>Land at Cobbetts Close, Worplesdon</td>
<td>Worplesdon</td>
<td>Traveller pitches (sui generis)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A52</td>
<td>Four Acre Stables, Aldershot Road, Worplesdon</td>
<td>Worplesdon</td>
<td>Traveller pitches (sui generis)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A53</td>
<td>Roundoak, White Hart Lane, Wood Street Village</td>
<td>Worplesdon</td>
<td>Traveller pitches (sui generis)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A54</td>
<td>Lakeview, Lakeside Road, Ash Vale</td>
<td>Ash Vale</td>
<td>Traveller pitches (sui generis)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A55</td>
<td>The Orchard, Puttenham Heath Road, Puttenham</td>
<td>The Pilgrims</td>
<td>Traveller pitches (sui generis)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, we do have some concerns about the implementation of the proposals and the impact it could potentially have on existing Gypsies and Travellers who live on these sites where comprehensive redevelopment/ intensification / redesign is proposed.

Whilst additional pitches and improvements to site facilities are welcomed, it is an imperative that existing occupiers are fully consulted on any proposals and their views taken into account prior to any commencement of works. Without knowing the full details of the proposals, or the exact nature of the sites, it would appear that some of these could not be implemented without existing occupiers being willing to relocate within a site, if only for a temporary period.

We would strongly advise that the Council engage with everyone who may already live on these sites prior to progressing any of these proposals further. Engagement should be fit for purpose, and include face to face meetings in order that the wishes of existing on site Gypsies and Travellers can be taken into account.

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

**Attached documents:**

| A56 | Valley Park Equestrian, East Shalford Lane, Shalford | Shalford | Traveller pitches (sui generis) | 5 |
| A57 | The Paddocks, Rose Lane, Ripley | Lovelace | Traveller pitches (sui generis) | 4 |

I OBJECT to all strategic sites proposed in the draft Plan to be built in the Green Belt.

1. I object to the identification and allocation of sites in this plan without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other constraints. **The plan says that “allocating these sites does not grant planning permission for development.”** However, each of the sites will be removed from the Green Belt and will be available in principle for development and non-Green Belt The inclusion of these sites without detailed site by site justification shows contempt for the thousands of detailed comments the Council have received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. The plan has hardly changed since the Council received 20,000 objections to its first draft plan in 2014. The Inspector considering the plan may conclude that the consultation has not been properly conducted.
2. The housing needs assessment is flawed in various respects and overstates housing In addition since it was produced, the referendum Brexit decision has almost certainly reduced future housing need and rendered the previous assessment seriously out of date. As a result any assessment of Green Belt sites which took place to consider whether “exceptional circumstances” existed to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt was based on false premises and should be reconsidered.
3. Having determined housing need the Council was entitled to consider constraints before determining the housing number. I believe that as Ill as being entitled to do this the Council was required to give proper consideration to The scarcity of sites outside the Green Belt as Ill as infrastructure (most notable roads) considerations all represented constraints which should have been taken into account in determining the final housing number. Accordingly in this regard our objection to the allocation of Green Belt sites is twofold. First I believe constraints should have been applied. Secondly I believe the Council did not properly consider constraints and that their decision making process was flawed and thus subject to being set aside by the Inspector.
4. Even if having properly applied constraints there is a need to develop in the Green Belt then specific Green Belt sites should not be included in the plan unless “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven in relation to that specific site, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has There needs to be a specific balancing exercise conducted on each Green Belt site weighing the harm to the Green Belt against the very special circumstances which are argued in favour of development at that particular site. There is no evidence this has been done. Instead the council have appeared to say that having chosen a housing needs figure and decided it cannot be met without building on Green Belt then there is no need for any further consideration and any convenient Green Belt site can be allocated for building at will.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3940</th>
<th>Respondent: 15466113 / Tim Grey</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

SITES - POLICIES A1 TO A57

I OBJECT to all strategic sites proposed in the draft Plan to be built in the Green Belt.

1. I object to the identification and allocation of sites in this plan without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other The plan says that “allocating these sites does not grant planning permission for development.” However, each of the sites will be removed from the Green Belt and will be available in principle for development and non-Green Belt uses. The inclusion of these sites without detailed site by site justification shows contempt for the thousands of detailed comments the Council have received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. The plan has hardly changed since the Council received 20,000 objections to its first draft plan in 2014. The Inspector considering the plan may conclude that the consultation has not been properly conducted.

2. The housing needs assessment is flawed in various respects and overstates housing. In addition since it was produced, the referendum Brexit decision has almost certainly reduced future housing need and rendered the previous assessment seriously out of date. As a result any assessment of Green Belt sites which took place to consider whether “exceptional circumstances” existed to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt was based on false premises and should be reconsidered.

3. Having determined housing need the Council was entitled to consider constraints before determining the housing number. I believe that as Ill as being entitled to do this the Council was required to give proper consideration to The scarcity of sites outside the Green Belt as Ill as infrastructure (most notable roads) considerations all represented constraints which should have been taken into account in determining the final housing number. Accordingly in this regard our objection to the allocation of Green Belt sites is twofold. First I believe constraints should have been applied. Secondly I believe the Council did not properly consider constraints and that their decision making process was flawed and thus subject to being set aside by the Inspector.

4. Even if having properly applied constraints there is a need to develop in the Green Belt then specific Green Belt sites should not be included in the plan unless “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven in relation to that specific site, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has There needs to be a specific balancing exercise conducted on each Green Belt site weighing the harm to the Green Belt against the very special circumstances which are argued in favour of development at that particular site. There is no evidence this has been done. Instead the council have appeared to say that having chosen a housing needs figure and decided it cannot be met without building on Green Belt then there is no need for any further consideration and any convenient Green Belt site can be allocated for building at will.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4387  Respondent: 15482817 / C.E. Pullen  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

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

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

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

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

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

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2649  Respondent: 15495521 / Jonathan Young  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Introduction
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I SUPPORT the REMOVAL of sites A46 and A47.

The basis for originally identifying these sites was flawed, due to the manipulation of the rules governing the criteria for “sustainability” and “sensitivity”, the misrepresentation of what constituted a “settlement” for different purposes, and the lack of consideration for the contribution to open space. In addition, the business case for the proposed school was also shown to be miscalculated.

In addition, due to the increase in housing now being proposed in Ash, Ash Green and Tongham, sites A46 and A47 represent areas that are even more critical in maintaining openness and defending the Greenbelt from further planning intrusion in the future.

I also refer to my original statements from my response dated 13/07/2016 sent from my email address [removed] to localplan@guildford.gov.uk on 15/07/2016
I OBJECT to the INCREASE in housing numbers proposed for site A29. The actual total housing target for the entire plan is still not justified and demonstrates a "continuous growth" strategy by the Guildford Borough Council based on economic targets rather than housing need. The numbers planned for Ash and Ash Green will result in major infrastructure (road and rail) congestion.

I OBJECT to the Traveller pitches at site A49. Normandy already has a disproportionately high number of traveller pitches in its vicinity. These should be distributed across the borough.

I OBJECT to the Travelling showpeople plots at site A50. Normandy already has a disproportionately high number of traveller plots in its vicinity. These should be distributed across the borough.

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

1. Do not increase the housing numbers for site A29.
2. Remove sites A49 and A50

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5198  Respondent: 15503265 / Harriet Richardson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction

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

4 HOUSING LAND SUPPLY

Annual Monitoring Report

4.1 The recent Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) published in October 2015 to assess the period of 2014-2015 showed that net completions that year had been just This is an under delivery of 80 dwellings against the interim housing figure and an under delivery of 451 units when assessed against the annual housing target for the plan period identified in the Proposed Submission Local Plan. The previous interim housing figure of 322 dwellings per annum agreed on May 2012 did not take account of up to date assessments of housing need and therefore was not NPPF compliant. The phased delivery of housing proposed will further exacerbate this issue.

4.2 The AMR states that ‘housing provision is currently restricted by the lack of available and deliverable development land in the borough….delivery rate is only likely to increase when larger areas of land are suitable and available for development”. This demonstrates the need in the district for large scale strategic sites such as the land adjoining Fairlands. These representations therefore identify the key reasons why the site should be considered appropriate for housing and should be reinstated in the Local Plan for removal from the Green Be Paragraph 83 of the NPPF addresses removal of land from the Green Belt and states that boundaries 'should only be altered in exceptional circumstance’. The current under delivery of housing is considered to be an exceptional circumstance and as a result Green Belt land such as the site at Fairlands should continue to be considered as an allocation site in the final Local Plan.

5 Year Housing Land Supply

4.3 The NPPF addresses the matter of housing land supplies in Paragraph 47 which stipulates a requirement for Local Planning Authorities (LPA) to “identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5%.” It goes on to state that where there has been persistent under-delivery of housing in the district or borough, LPAs should increase the buffer to
20%. It is clear that GBC cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply with in the region of only 4-2.5 years supply being currently identifiable. This will continue to be the case if GBC adopt the phased process identified in table 1 of this report.

4.4 The level of under delivery of housing is also likely to perpetuate as inward migration from the London Boroughs continues. Much of the SHMA is based on figures from 2012 which are now out of date and no longer accord with the population projections supplied by the Office of National Statistics (ONS) which show that by 2037, the population of Surrey is expected to increase by over 200,000.

4.5 It is therefore considered essential that previously identified deliverable sites, such as the land at Fairlands are included in the final Local Plan document as development allocations.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5209  Respondent: 15503265 / Harriet Richardson  Agent:  

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction

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

7 CONCLUSION

7.1 It is acknowledged by GBC that it does not have a five year land supply against the OAN target of 693 dwellings per annum. This is exacerbated by a continuous under delivery of development in recent years, as well as the proposed phased approach taken by GBC to backload the housing delivery to the later part of the plan period.

7.2 There is an evident housing shortage in the borough in the immediate term and a reliance upon some sites which have serious deliverability constraints has the propensity to exacerbate this deficiency. In addition, the Local Plan recognises that Green Belt land will need to be developed in order to meet the OANs for the borough. In light of this, there is no rationale for the removal of Fairlands Land from the Local Plan as a former proposed allocation site. The land is available and deliverable, and capable of assisting in meeting the current pressing housing need, particularly as the former proposed allocation removed the site from the Green Belt.

7.3 GBC has identified at least two major strategic sites which are anticipated to deliver circa 3,000 dwellings to assist in meeting the 693 dwelling per annum figure, that have significant deliverability problems. Simultaneously GBC has removed the land at Fairlands which is capable of delivering circa 500 dwellings if released from the Green Belt as previously proposed in the Draft Local Plan. On this basis, the land to the west and south west of Fairlands should be allocated as a development site to assist in meeting the borough’s OAN and allowed to provide certainty in the event that any of the currently identified sites fail to come forward.

7.4 There can be no justification for an authority which has an immediate housing deficit, a lack of genuinely deliverable sites and Green Belt constraints to backload such significant proportions of projected housing delivery to the later stages of the plan period. Land adjoining Fairlands had previously been identified as suitable for release from the Green Belt, it is available and it is deliverable now. The site should, therefore, be introduced as an allocation for residential development during the current plan period.

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

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to all strategic sites proposed in the draft Plan to be built in the Green Belt.

1. I object to the identification and allocation of sites in this plan without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other constraints. The plan says that “allocating these sites does not grant planning permission for development.” However, each of the sites will be removed from the Green Belt and will be available in principle for development and non-Green Belt uses. The inclusion of these sites without detailed site by site justification shows contempt for the thousands of detailed comments the Council have received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. The plan has hardly changed since the Council received 20,000 objections to its first draft plan in 2014. The Inspector considering the plan may conclude that the consultation has not been properly conducted.

2. The housing needs assessment is flawed in various respects and overstates housing need. In addition since it was produced, the referendum Brexit decision has almost certainly reduced future housing need and rendered the previous assessment seriously out of date. As a result any assessment of Green Belt sites which took place to consider whether “exceptional circumstances” existed to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt was based on false premises and should be reconsidered.

3. Having determined housing need the Council was entitled to consider constraints before determining the housing number. I believe that as Ill as being entitled to do this the Council was required to give proper consideration to constraints. The scarcity of sites outside the Green Belt as Ill as infrastructure (most notable roads) considerations all represented constraints which should have been taken into account in determining the final housing number. Accordingly in this regard our objection to the allocation of Green Belt sites is twofold. First I believe constraints should have been applied. Secondly I believe the Council did not properly consider constraints and that their decision making process was flawed and thus subject to being set aside by the Inspector.

4. Even if having properly applied constraints there is a need to develop in the Green Belt then specific Green Belt sites should not be included in the plan unless “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven in relation to that specific site, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established. There needs to be a specific balancing exercise conducted on each Green Belt site weighing the harm to the Green Belt against the very special circumstances which are argued in favour of development at that particular site. There is no evidence this has been done. Instead the council have appeared to say that having chosen a housing needs figure and decided it cannot be met without building on Green Belt then there is no need for any further consideration and any convenient Green Belt site can be allocated for building at will.

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

Attached documents:
• The site is not big enough to provide satisfactory living standards even for “affordable housing”.
• Four and five storey buildings are not appropriate in the rural environment nor on an elevated site.
• Residents will be crammed in with little outdoor space, a noisy location, with very poor air quality. The density of housing proposed is similar to that in Islington.
• The site is clearly visible from the Surrey Hills AONB and as a result it will have a negative impact on views to and from the AONB.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6142</th>
<th>Respondent: 15584993 / Jan Lofthouse</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The absence of any exceptional circumstances justifying removal of the site from the Green Belt. The only justification for releasing the site is said to be the shortfall in available sites to meet the housing needs of the Borough. However the Council’s own evidence base demonstrates that the release of this site is not, in fact, required in order to meet the housing need. Thus:

1. Draft policy S2 states that 13,860 new dwellings will be provided over the Plan period in order to meet the identified housing need, based on a FOAN of 693 dpa (693 x 20 years = 13,860).
2. However the LAA advises that, not including sites with planning permission, sufficient land is already available to construct 13,708 new dwellings over the next 15 years i.e. up to 2031 (with any development from 2031-2033 to be added to this total).
3. There are 1,342 homes with planning permission which are expected to deliver new homes within the next five years, as well as 66 homes in the 11-15 year period.
4. Accordingly, there is already provision for a total of 15,116 new homes, even without taking into account completions for 2013-2014 (132), 2014-2015 (242) and 2015-Feb 2016.

Even on the Council’s own analysis, there is therefore a significant surplus of available land compared to the identified housing need, and this surplus has previously been acknowledged by the Leader of the Council. Consequently, the housing need cannot amount to exceptional circumstances justifying the release of this site. Moreover, as noted above, the expert advice received by WAG is that the FOAN of 693 dpa is far too high and that the correct figure is in fact 510 dpa, or 10,200 dwellings over the plan period. On this analysis the available land far exceeds the identified housing need.

G B C Has plenty of land to use in the Borough to develop on, without touching the Green Belt. Please leave Green Belt Land alone. Once it is gone, it is gone FOREVER

Please use your brown field and derelict sites and alter your SHMA figures and you need never touch green belt land.

SIMPLES!

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6287</th>
<th>Respondent: 15588033 / Oliver Hogben</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Introduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am a Send resident, writing during this consultation period to make clear that I object wholesale to every aspect of the proposed GBC Local Plan. For the purposes of absolute clarity, I object to:

  • Policy A25
  • Policy A35
  • Policy A42
  • Policy A43
  • Policy A43a
  • Policy A44

All of the above policies should be removed from the GBC Local Plan.

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

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

Sites

It is noted that there are 57 proposed site allocations in the plan for a range of uses, including for housing, employment, retail and traveller pitches. The housing/mixed use sites provide for a wide range of dwellings from 10 units up to 2000 units. Most of these sites are some distance from Waverley but one (A29), which would deliver around 1,200 homes in the Tongham and Ash Green area, contains two parcels around Grange Farm that are close to the junction of the A31 and the A331 and also close to boundary with Waverley. One of these parcels is subject to a current hybrid planning application for 254 dwellings and associated SANG with the housing in Guildford and the SANG in Waverley. It would be important for any impacts from this allocation, including impacts on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA to be addressed in this or any subsequent planning application.

In addition, there are several large strategic sites of between 1,000 and 2,000 dwellings that are close to the Guildford urban area and are near to the A3 trunk road. These include sites A24 (Siyfield Area), A25 (Gosden Hill Farm), A26 (Blackwell Farm) and A35 (former Wisley airfield). It will be important to ensure that the impacts of these developments on the A3 are carefully assessed in conjunction with planned improvements to the A3, for example the section from the A320 to the Hog's Back (A31 junction) in the Road Investment Strategy (RIS). Traffic using the A3 has a significant impact on Waverley and so it is essential that these impacts are mitigated.

As a more general comment, the Council would welcome confirmation that in the detailed assessment of any more significant sites that may have cross-boundary impacts, the impacts on Waverley's infrastructure and services will be considered and, if necessary, addressed.

Conclusions

To confirm our response to the 2014 draft Guildford Local Plan, Waverley acknowledges the considerable effort that Guildford is seeking to meet its identified housing needs and supports the number of homes per annum proposed in the plan which would meet the objectively assessed needs in the SHMA. However, future developments in Guildford have the potential to have an impact on Waverley, both individually and cumulatively.

The Council would again like to stress the importance of and our commitment to continued joint working and liaison between Guildford and Waverley as our respective new Local Plans reach a critical stage.

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

Attached documents:
Proposed Allocations for Housing Provision

Send Parish Council consider the proposed level of housing provision to be unsound due to the number of allocated homes being significantly greater than the identified need. Whilst Send Parish support an approach to housing delivery that meets the objectively assessed need in the Borough, the allocations set out in the June 2016 Proposed Submission Local Plan represent over-development. The following section demonstrates that sufficient justification has not been provided for the levels of residential development proposed.

The West Surrey Strategic Housing Market Area is comprised of Guildford, Waverley and Woking Boroughs. The September 2015 West Surrey Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) identifies a need for 693 Dwellings Per Annum (DPA) in Guildford. Policy S2: Borough Wide Strategy, of the Proposed Submission Local Plan expects a total of 10,395 homes to be delivered between 2018 and 2033. This results in an average of 693 DPA in accordance with the SHMA.

Table 1 of Policy S2 sets out the planned delivery of housing between 2018 and 2033. Sufficient allocations are made to deliver 13,652 homes in this period; an average of 910 DPA, or 131% of the requirement identified in the SHMA. Paragraph 4.1.12 of the Proposed Submission Local Plan acknowledges that the number of homes set out in table 1 is greater than the number of homes required by policy S2 and that this is deliberate in order to build in flexibility.

The Guildford Borough Economy and Infrastructure Executive Advisory Board met on 13 April 2016 to review the draft Local Plan before it was released for consultation. Concern was raised regarding the over provision of land allocated in the Proposed Submission Local Plan when compared to the Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) figure. The Leader of the Council confirmed that this was required to ensure that the Council could meet the OAN by enabling Guildford Borough Council to have flexibility, however no justification was provided for the significant over provision.

No evidence is presented to justify allocating sites to provide 131% of the objectively assessed need. Whilst some allocated sites will inevitably not be brought forward, sites should only be allocated if they are genuinely considered to be deliverable. If the Council has evidence to suggest that approximately a quarter of the allocated sites are undeliverable then this calls for a serious re-appraisal of the proposed allocations. The Parish Council consider an approach to allocation in line with national policy to be more appropriate.

The March 2012 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 47 clearly sets out the requirements for Local Planning Authorities to deliver housing through the Local Plan process. Councils should use the evidence base to ensure that the full OAN for the housing market area is met. This is recognised as 693 DPA.

NPPF Paragraph 47 requires that planning authorities demonstrate on an annual basis that there is a sufficient supply of land for five years’ worth of housing, with an additional buffer of 5%. This can be increased to a 20% buffer where there is persistent under delivery of housing. This gives a strong indication of the level of provision that the Council should be
planning for and a buffer of 5% to 20% would be considered to be a far more appropriate level of flexibility. Based upon the requirement for 693 DPA, this would necessitate between 727 DPA and 832 DPA (as compared to 910 DPA provided for in the draft Local Plan), or sufficient allocations for between 10,915 and 12,474 homes. This suggests that there is currently a proposed over-allocation of between 1,178 and 2,737 homes throughout the plan period.

Send Parish are concerned that this has resulted in the allocation of sites that are not suitable for development. Sections three, four and five of this statement addresses this point further.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7882  **Respondent:** 15667489 / Tibbalds (Jon Herbert)  **Agent:**

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

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

In summary, Send Parish consider the following changes to be necessary to make the Proposed Submission Local Plan sound:

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7798  **Respondent:** 15674273 / Savills for Thames Water (Katherine Jones)  **Agent:**

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

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

**Specific Water Supply and Sewerage/Wastewater Infrastructure Comments:**

Water treatment and wastewater/sewage treatment capacity maybe a constraint in some catchments within the Guildford Borough area. As the Local Plan is finalised we will be reviewing which of our treatment sites need upgrades to accommodate the growth and we are willing to have a meeting with the Council to discuss this.

The attached table provides Thames Water’s site specific comments from desktop assessments on water supply and sewerage/wastewater infrastructure in relation to the proposed housing sites, but more detailed modelling may be required to refine the requirements.

These sites have been assessed on an individual base with only limited opportunity to consider cumulative impacts. Therefore, the impact of multiple sites in the same area coming forward may have a greater impact. The scale, location and time to deliver any required network upgrades will be determined after receiving a clearer picture of the location, type and scale of development together with its phasing.

Where we have identified sites where drainage infrastructure is likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development, in the first instance a drainage strategy would be required from the developer to determine the exact impact on our infrastructure and the significance of the infrastructure required to support the development in line with the Core Strategy Policy IN2: Water Supply and Wastewater.
It should be noted that in the event of an upgrade to our sewerage network assets being required, up to three years lead in time is usual to enable for the planning and delivery of the upgrade. As a developer has the automatic right to connect to our sewer network under the Water Industry Act we may also request a drainage planning condition if a network upgrade is required to ensure the infrastructure is in place ahead of occupation of the development. This will avoid adverse environmental impacts such as sewer flooding and / or water pollution.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7981  **Respondent:** 15688481 / Sally Lescher  **Agent:**

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

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

**ABSENCE OF POLICY ON RIVER WEY**

I object to the omission of a policy for the River Wey which was included in the previous local plan. The existing policy G11 from 2003 Local Plan should be included so that development within the River Wey corridor will only be permitted provided that:

- It protects or improves the special character of the River Wey and the Guildford and Godalming Navigations, in particular their visual, setting, amenities, ecological value, architectural and historic interest;
- The special character of the landscape and townscape in the corridor is protected or improved;
- Views both within and from the corridor which contribute to this special character are protected or improved;
- Where appropriate, public access is provided to and along the River and the Navigations.
- The Nature Conservation value of the site is protected or improved

**GREEN BELT SITES**

I object to ALL Green Belt sites allocated for development in the local plan

I object to the identification and allocation of sites in this plan without regard to Green Belt, infrastructure or other constraints. The plan says that “allocating these sites does not grant planning permission for development, however, it does identify the principle of development and uses.” This ignores the tens of thousands of detailed comments the Council have received about individual sites ever since the Issues and Options consultation in 2013. This amounts to a war of attrition by the Council in conjunction with developers, since many busy residents are tired of repeating the same comments as it appears to be a waste of time and effort. The plan has hardly changed since the Council received 20,000 objections to its first draft plan in 2014.13

All Green Belt sites should be removed from the plan until “exceptional circumstances” for development are proven, as stipulated repeatedly in the NPPF. The Green Belt should trump short-term considerations such as perceived housing need, as case law has established.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4122  **Respondent:** 15689793 / Gladman Developments (Mat Evans)  **Agent:**
7.4 Sites

7.4.1 Whilst making no comments regarding the specific allocations proposed within the plan Gladman note that a number of the proposed allocations contain a mix of residential and gypsy and traveller sites within the same allocation.

7.4.2 Flexibility should be provided to these allocations to ensure that the delivery of such allocations do not stall due to gypsy and traveller provision.

7.4.3 Gladman also note the change in capacity of a number of sites and the removal of a number of sites entirely from the plan as now written. Again it is not considered that the Council has prepared and demonstrated a sufficiently robust evidence base to justify these changes, especially when seen in the context of the deficit of housing proposed within the plan, which falls well short of meeting the OAN for Guildford and helping meet the unmet housing needs of the HMA.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/273  Respondent: 17153633 / Martin Dowland  Agent: Obsidian Strategic

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Introduction

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

A26 should be removed. This is not compliant with the intentions set out in P1-5;

The accurate SHMA assessment, recently identified and presented by GRA should be applied which will greatly reduce housing figures;

The Council has not convincingly responded to or reacted to vast public objections

The strategy for the development of the University of Surrey is based on the assumption that it must develop all of its facilities in Guildford rather than share across Surrey.

The site A26 is in the proximity of the Surrey Hills, the significance of which is not being addressed.

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

Review of all sites threatened with development in view of the corrected SHMA figure presented by the GRA.

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1583  Respondent: 17156321 / Blackonyx Developments (Philip Scott)  Agent: Obsidian Strategic (Philip Scott)

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Introduction

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
The draft list of housing sites is too heavily weighted towards major strategic housing sites which will not be delivered in the front end of the Local Plan period. Such an approach will exacerbate the acute need for housing in the borough which is already failing to keep pace with need and failing to deliver a 5 year housing land supply. Indeed, not only is the council moving into the Examination with a 3.2 year housing land supply (this represents a serious housing land deficit) but the Council is also proposing a further accumulated shortfall of 1000 units against its annualised housing target until the draft allocated major housing sites come on stream from 2026.

Despite this context, smaller sites which could deliver housing are either being omitted from the draft Local Plan or are being removed from previous draft iterations of the Local Plan. For example brownfield sites such as Tyrrell site adjacent Long Reach, West Horsley have been identified in the Council's housing evidence base as being suitable to deliver new housing. Tyrrell is a former factory site which is now inefficient and its buildings are in need of major repair and investment. Its rural location also means that attracting investment would lead to greater numbers of HGVs and service vehicles and more noise and disturbance. Planning officers have previously acknowledged that the site is suitable to accommodate new housing development (there is already a residential house on-site in addition to the old factory and storage units and the consented additional B8 building which has already been commenced as in therefore 'live').

However, the Council's housing strategy has omitted this brownfield site when it could help the Council's housing strategy and (with other sites) alleviate pressure on the need for greenfield and undeveloped Green Belt sites.

Such an approach would also be entirely compatible with the Council's 'brownfield first' approach to housing land delivery.

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

The draft list of housing sites identified under 'Previously Developed Land in the Green Belt' should include the Tyrrell site, Long Reach, West Horsley as being appropriate for redevelopment subject to design and other planning policy considerations.

**Attached documents:**
As a resident in Ripley, I object to the new local plan put forward by Guildford Council, which are: Site A43 Garlicks Arch, Site A58 Burt Common and Site A42 Tannery Lane. I strongly believe that the plans put forward will be difficult to complete as they are unrealistic and inconsiderate.

First of all, the increase in housing numbers from 45 to 60 at Site people in Tannery Lane will have use Polesdon Lane to get to Ripley high street, as well as Woking, and the A3. Using these roads every single day, I can clearly state that Ripley and its little lanes are already majorly crowded, unable to take two-way traffic, which is dangerous as cars are already driving on pavements, putting pedestrians in danger. Also, this means that children walking and playing are endangered.

Secondly, the creation of an industrial zone and waste management within a small village seems extremely inconceivable given that this can only lead to further increased traffic, likely to be trucks, in a small residential village. This goes back to my previous comment about the safety of residents.

Finally, the inclusion of 6 x Travelling Showpeople plots with associated storage facilities is entirely inappropriate in a rural environment within the Greenbelt. The allocation of these plots would [Response has been reacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature] which would affect the current residents who, some, have been here for years.

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

Attached documents:

We fully support the removal of A46 and A47 from the site list. It is clear that the current infrastructure would be unable to cope with developments of this magnitude, especially the roads, flooding and power cut frequency and the already burdened health system. Also important to highlight that both sites are Green Belt and for A47 specifically, has SNCI status.

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

We fully support the removal of A46 and A47 from the site list. It is clear that the current infrastructure would be unable to cope with developments of this magnitude, especially the roads, flooding and power cut frequency and the already burdened health system. Also important to highlight that both sites are Green Belt and for A47 specifically, has SNCI status.

Attached documents:
**Comment ID:** pslp172/2688  **Respondent:** 17343265 / Martin Brown  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Introduction

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

With regard to site A35, development at the site of the former Wisley airfield, although I welcome the change in the number of new homes to be created from ‘over 2000’ to ‘approximately 2000’, this change does not go far enough. Approximately allows for a figure considerably more than 2000 and the number should be amended again. I strongly object to the plan to inset the site from the green belt - although developed and used during the war as an airfield, the site was previously rural and it should be returned to its original usage. Nevertheless, if the borough insists on supporting this unwelcome development, then the proposed number of houses is still far too many and will result in a very crowded site, out of keeping with local patterns of building. The increase in the local population will result in an even greater increase in traffic on the local roads, increasing pollution, demand on services, waiting times in the local surgery, and congestion at the local railway stations. The size of the development is out of keeping with the local village of Ockham. The proposals to ensure the developers include infrastructure such as new schools etc will not address the issue that the increase in number of people will change the character of the local environment and congestion in the surrounding areas. In my view the number of proposed homes should therefore be reduced to 500. However, if the borough will not cut down the number in spite of the strong local opposition to the proposals at least ‘approximately 2000’ should be changed to ‘no more than 2000’.

I also welcome the removal of A36 and A41 from the proposed sites for development in East and West Horsley, but I object to the numbers of houses still proposed in the other local developments A37 to A41 inclusive. These are excessive and the numbers of proposed properties at all of these sites should be halved in order to maintain an adequate rural quality to the local environment without unduly increasing the pressures on the local services, transport etc.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2684  **Respondent:** 17343585 / Andrew Dawson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Introduction

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

See below for further amendments

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

I wish to object to the 2017 Proposed Submission of the Local Plan (Strategy and Sites) for the following reasons.

1. Policy P3 - Countryside

   • Ash Green is not part of the Ash & Tongham Urban Area and therefore the ATUA boundary must not extend south of Ash Green Road and Foreman Road

   • 4.3.29 Amend to: “Originally consisting of the three small rural villages of Ash, Ash Vale and Tongham, the Ash and Tongham urban area has grown considerably in size and now forms Guildford borough’s second largest urban area. Countryside within the urban area to the south and east is allocated as a strategic location for development. However to make this growth sustainable, suitable infrastructure must be implemented before further development.”

   • 4.3.30 Amend to: “We do however wish to ensure that whilst accommodating this growth, we are able to protect the remaining countryside around it from inappropriate development in order to protect its intrinsic character and preserve the
role it plays in maintaining the separate identity of Ash, Tongham and Ash Green.”

- Policy P3 Amend to: (1) (c) should be amended to read “does not lead to greater physical or visual coalescence between the Ash and Tongham urban area, Ash Green and Aldershot.”

2. Policy A29: Land to the south and east of Ash and Tongham

- I object to the increase from 1200 to 1750 homes as this would result in the coalescence of the Ash & Tongham Urban Area and Ash Green Village. This is contrary to Policy P3 (Countryside). Therefore Requirement 6 of this Policy, which attempts to protect the “historic location of Ash Green”, is inadequate and would need rewording to prevent this increased potential for coalescence.

2. Policy A29: Land to the south and east of Ash and Tongham (Cont.)

“Development proposals in the vicinity of Ash Green to have recognition of the historic location of Ash Green village and the intrinsic rural character of its countryside location. The properties along Ash Green Road form part of Ash Green village. Proposals for the land west of this road and to the south east of Foreman Road / White Lane must respect the historical context of this area by preventing the coalescence of Ash, Tongham and Ash Green. Any development as a whole will not be of a size and scale that would detract from the character of the rural landscape. This must include the provision of a green buffer that maintains separation between the any proposed new development and the properties fronting onto Ash Green Road, Foreman Road and White Lane. This will also help soften the edges of the strategic development location and provide a transition between the built up area and the countryside beyond”

- Requirement 8 does not sufficiently protect Ash Manor, a historical farmstead of three listed buildings including a medieval hall house and should be amended as follows:

“Sensitive design at site boundaries with the adjacent complex of listed buildings at Ash Manor. Views to and from this heritage asset, including their approach from White Lane, must be protected.”

- Infrastructure before development. Requirement 9 (Land and provision for a new road bridge at Ash Station to enable closure of the level crossing) must be competed before any development of Policy A29 commences.

- Requirement 9 fails to address the other significant transport infrastructure improvements that are required to cope with the increases in traffic generated by Policy A29. Therefore solutions to the following areas are also required before any development of A29 is permitted.

  a) The Street in Tongham
  b) A331/A323 intersection
  c) A31/White Lane junction

- Ash Green is not part of the Ash & Tongham Urban Area and therefore the ATUA boundary must not extend south of Ash Green Road and Foreman Road.

3. Policy A28: Land to the east of White Lane, Ash Green

- Correct title of Policy A28 to say Ash Green, and not Ash.

- Policies A27, A28 and A29 collectively increase Ash Green village by 50%. Opportunity exists under Policy A28 to provide a village/community hall and recreational area which would provide Ash Green with much needed community and social space.

  Opportunities (1) Should read: “To create a centre for the village by including a village hall with associated recreational space providing much needed facilities for the Ash Green community. A mix of homes (C3) and accommodation for older people (C2) could be appropriate for this site.”

- Ash Green is not part of the Ash & Tongham Urban Area and therefore the ATUA boundary must not extend south of Ash Green Road and Foreman Road.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Policy A1 - The Plaza, Portsmouth Road, Guildford
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/3708</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8561377 / The Guildford Society (Julian Lyon)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1. The Plaza, Portsmouth Road Guildford – we note the increase from 70 to 90 dwellings (contrasted with the current planning application for 104 homes) at a density of 237 dPH. We are concerned that, at this density there is likely to be very little amenity on site and/or the massing of development will intrude inappropriately on the skyline. We do welcome the addition of the words “and views into and out of surrounding conservation areas.” We hope ‘innovative design’ does not translate into a design which is out of place on the site or in the heart of an ancient market town.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/2669</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8575585 / Ian Macpherson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1: The Plaza, Portsmouth Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is at the moment the subject of an unsuitable planning application. It has a planning approval for offices, and that would set a reasonable envelope for residential [of oneform or another], which seems to be the presently preferred ‘use’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/571</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8608865 / WBDRA. (David Bird)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBDRA is in SUPPORT of this policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/976</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8848033 / Paul Gerrard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to housing on this site. This is a previously developed site, so makes sense to redevelop it. However, it was not previously used for housing and is within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, and therefore any redevelopment, especially for housing, is subject to EU/UK legislation (NPPF 119). The impact of development cannot be mitigated with SANGs because at present there is no evidence base to support SANGs as required by NRM6 viii, NPPF 158 and 166.

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

Attached documents:

Pegasuslife is the landowner of the Site identified in draft Policy A1 with a draft allocation for approximately 70 dwellings (Use Class C3). The extent of the Site is identified on the plan accompanying Policy A1. The Site has been the subject of significant pre-application discussions with your Officers for proposed development to provide assisted living accommodation for older people with communal facilities and health and wellbeing facilities. The Council concluded that the proposed development is a Sui Generis Use Class in September 2015.

A planning application was subsequently submitted to GBC in April 2016 on behalf of Pegasuslife and is currently subject to determination, for the provision of:

Proposed assisted living accommodation for older people (sui generis) comprising 103 apartments and communal facilities including; residents lounge, guest suite, health and well-being facilities, restaurant, staff offices, surface and basement car parking, cycle parking, bin storage, plant room, associated hard and soft landscaping, and groundworks.

On behalf of Pegasuslife, we support the principle of draft Policy A1, which confirms the acceptability for redevelopment at the Site for residential purposes. However, we object to the sole allocation of the Site for residential use (Use Class C3).
and consider the Site should instead be allocated for residential (Use Class C3) and/or assisted living accommodation for older people (Sui Generis).

Assisted living accommodation for older people is considered to be an entirely appropriate land use given the Site's location within the Town Centre. The Site has good levels of accessibility via walking, cycling and public transport modes. Both Guildford Railway Station and Guildford Bus Station are within an 8 minute walk from the Site.

The number of older people in the UK is growing and the HAPP! 3 Report1 (June 2016) states that the number of people aged 80 and above will more than double by 2037 and the number of people aged over 90 will triple. The number of centenarians (i.e. those older than 100 years old) shows an increase of sevenfold in estimates from 14,450 in mid-2014 to 111,000 in mid-2037.

In the light of the rate of change, it is not surprising that there is a chronic undersupply of suitable housing for older people in the UK with retirement properties making up just 2% of the housing stock (approximately 533,000 homes). To put this into perspective, the over 65 population is approximately 10 million and the over 60 population is approx imately 14 million. Evidently, the demand for suitable housing for older people significantly outweighs the supply.

The ONS Annual mid-year population estimates (2014) for the UK (published in June 2015), estimates a rise in the medium age of the population to 40-years (the highest ever estimated) as the number and therefore proportion of older people continue to rise, up 0.3% in a year. This only reinforces the need for a response to the crisis.

Accordingly, the NPPF (para 50) encourages a wide choice of quality homes that widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities. Local Authorities are required to plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community. This includes older people and people with disabilities. The revisions to the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) (March 2015) strengthen the requirement for LPAs to plan and provide housing for older people.

Paragraph 4.2.7 of the PSLP confirms that self-contained accommodation for the elderly will contribute to GBC's local housing requirement. The sustainable location of the Site therefore makes it appropriate for this land use to make an important contribution to local housing need.

Paragraph 4.2.8 recognises that efficient use of land is essential and certain areas can accommodate higher densities. The Site is sustainably located within Guildford Town Centre and perfectly placed to accommodate higher densities. We therefore object to the allocation of approximately 70 dwellings. Notably, no evidence has been presented to support the proposed quantum of 70 units. In this regard, the Policy is not 'Justified' and therefore is "unsound" in this regard (NPPF, para 182).

We consider that the Site can accommodate approximately 90-100 dwellings, which is in line with the Pegasuslife's proposed response to consultation feedback received for the proposed development. It is considered appropriate that dwelling range is provided in order to be flexible and respond to prevailing circumstances.

We continue to support the requirement within draft Policy A1 that development proposals must be sensitive to the scale and heights of nearby Listed Buildings, and views of the church tower (St Nicholas Church).

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

Attached documents:
Under the ‘requirements’ section, the National Trust would wish to see the first bullet point amended to:

Development proposals must be sensitive to the scale and heights of nearby listed buildings, and views of the Church Tower (St Nicholas Church, Bury Street, Guildford) and views into the River Wey Corridor Conservation Area.

We would also question whether the opportunity for ‘improvements and reinstatement for pedestrian access and public realm’ are actually a fundamental design consideration for the site and therefore should be included under the ‘requirements’ heading.

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

Attached documents:
Draft Policy Al: The Plaza, Portsmouth Road, Guildford

Pegasuslife is the landowner of the Site identified in draft Policy Al with a draft allocation for approximately 70 dwellings (Use Class C3). The extent of the Site is identified on the plan accompanying Policy Al. The Site has been the subject of significant pre-application discussions with your Officers for proposed development to provide assisted living accommodation for older people with communal facilities and health and wellbeing facilities. The Council concluded that the proposed development is a Sui Generis Use Class in September 2015.

A planning application was subsequently submitted to GBC in April 2016 on behalf of Pegasuslife and is currently subject to determination, for the provision of:

Proposed assisted living accommodation for older people (sui generis) comprising 103 apartments and communal facilities including: residents lounge, guest suite, health and well-being facilities, restaurant, staff offices, surface and basement car parking, cycle parking, bin storage, plant room, associated hard and soft landscaping, and groundworks.

On behalf of Pegasus life, we support the principle of draft Policy Al, which confirms the acceptability for redevelopment at the Site for residential purposes. However, we object to the sole allocation of the Site for residential use (Use Class C3) and consider the Site should instead be allocated for residential (Use Class C3) and/or assisted living accommodation for older people (Sui Generis).

Assisted living accommodation for older people is considered to be an entirely appropriate land use given the Site’s location within the Town Centre. The Site has good levels of accessibility via walking, cycling and public transport modes. Both Guildford Railway Station and Guildford Bus Station are within an 8 minute walk from the Site.

The number of older people in the UK is growing and the HAPPI 3 Report1 (June 2016) states that the number of people aged 80 and above will more than double by 2037 and the number of people aged over 90 will triple. The number of centenarians (i.e. those older than 100 years old) shows an increase of sevenfold in estimates from 14,450 in mid-2014 to 111,000 in mid-2037.

In the light of the rate of change, it is not surprising that there is a chronic undersupply of suitable housing for older people in the UK with retirement properties making up just 2% of the housing stock (approximately 533,000 homes). To put this into perspective, the over 65 population is approximately 10 million and the over 60 population is approximately 14 million. Evidently, the demand for suitable housing for older people significantly outweighs the supply.

The ONS Annual mid-year population estimates (2014) for the UK (published in June 2015), estimates a rise in the medium age of the population to 40-years (the highest ever estimated) as the number and therefore proportion of older people continue to rise, up 0.3% in a year. This only reinforces the need for a response to the crisis.

Accordingly, the NPPF (para 50) encourages a wide choice of quality homes that widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities. Local Authorities are required to plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community. This includes older people and people with disabilities. The revisions to the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) (March 2015) strengthen the requirement for LPAs to plan and provide housing for older people.

Paragraph 4.2.7 of the PSLP confirms that self-contained accommodation for the elderly will contribute to GBC’s local housing requirement. The sustainable location of the Site therefore makes it appropriate for this land use to make an important contribution to local housing need.
Paragraph 4.2.8 recognises that efficient use of land is essential and certain areas can accommodate higher densities. The Site is sustainably located within Guildford Town Centre and perfectly placed to accommodate higher densities. We therefore object to the allocation of approximately 70 dwellings. Notably, no evidence has been presented to support the proposed quantum of 70 units. In this regard, the Policy is not 'Justified' and therefore is "unsound" in this regard (NPPF, para 182).

We consider that the Site can accommodate approximately 90-100 dwellings, which is in line with the Pegasuslife's proposed response to consultation feedback received for the proposed development. It is considered appropriate that dwelling range is provided in order to be flexible and respond to prevailing circumstances.

We continue to support the requirement within draft Policy A1 that development proposals must be sensitive to the scale and heights of nearby Listed Buildings, and views of the church tower (St Nicholas Church).

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

Attached documents:
Assisted living accommodation for older people is considered to be an entirely appropriate land use given the Site's location within the Town Centre. The Site has good levels of accessibility via walking, cycling and public transport modes. Both Guildford Railway Station and Guildford Bus Station are within an 8-minute walk from the Site.

The number of older people in the UK is growing and the HAPPI 3 Report1 (June 2016) states that the number of people aged 80 and above will more than double by 2037 and the number of people aged over 90 will triple. The number of centenarians (i.e. those older than 100 years old) shows an increase of sevenfold in estimates from 14,450 in mid-2014 to 111,000 in mid-2037.

In the light of the rate of change, it is not surprising that there is a chronic undersupply of suitable housing for older people in the UK with retirement properties making up just 2% of the housing stock (approximately 533,000 homes). To put this into perspective, the over 65 population is approximately 10 million and the over 60 population is approximately 14 million. Evidently, the demand for suitable housing for older people significantly outweighs the supply.

The ONS Annual mid-year population estimates (2014) for the UK (published in June 2015), estimates a rise in the medium age of the population to 40-years (the highest ever estimated) as the number and therefore proportion of older people continue to rise, up 0.3% in a year. This only reinforces the need for a response to the crisis.

Accordingly, the NPPF (Paragraph 50) encourages a wide choice of quality homes that widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities. LPAs are required to plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community, including older people and people with disabilities. The revisions to the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) (March 2015) strengthen the requirement for LPAs to plan and provide housing for older people.

Paragraph 4.2.7 of the Pre-Submission Local Plan confirms that self-contained accommodation for the elderly will contribute to GBC’s local housing requirement. The sustainable location of the Site therefore makes it appropriate for this land use to make an important contribution to local housing need.

Furthermore, GBC has confirmed the suitability of the Site to provide accommodation for older people within draft Policy A1 through the amendment of the Policy. However, this unduly restricts developments within the C2 Use Class, contrary to the currently submitted planning application and does not provide any flexibility or consideration that accommodation for older people falling within the Sui Generis Use Class would similarly be acceptable.

It is important to note that Pegasuslife consider that assisted living accommodation could be classed as C2 or Sui Generis; it is GBC who has determined that the proposals for the Site fall within the Sui Generis Use Class. It is therefore inconsistent of GBC not to reflect this position in the draft allocation for the Site.

We consider that the Site can accommodate approximately 90-100 dwellings, which is in line with Pegasuslife’s proposed response to consultation feedback received for the proposed development. It is considered appropriate that a dwelling range is provided in order to be flexible and respond to prevailing circumstances. Whilst we support the increase from the previously allocated 70 dwellings, it is submitted that a range of between 90 and 100 would be more appropriate.

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

Attached documents:
4.5 GVG would support this site coming forward for redevelopment and notes that an application has been submitted for 104 C2 units. GVG is interested to see if high quality design standards will be applied by GBC to this site, and if the massing is deemed to be appropriate to this location. The two disastrous high rise council blocks, directly opposite, should not be seen as a guide for what might be acceptable for this site.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>17484449 / Thames Water Utilities Ltd (Sir or Madam)</th>
<th>Agent: Savills (Richard Hill)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site ID</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>Water Response</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5351</td>
<td>Guildford Plaza (former Burymead House)</td>
<td>The water network capacity in this area may be unable to support the demand anticipated from this development. Local upgrades to the existing water network infrastructure may be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. The developer is encouraged to work Thames Water early on in the planning process to understand what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Attached documents:

Total records: 13.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Policy A2 - Guildford Cinema, Bedford Road, Guildford
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8238  Respondent: 8559297 / Holy Trinity Amenity Group (Robert Bromham)  Agent:

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

Town Centre Riverside Sites, Open Space.

We welcome the designation of protected open space for the immediate riverside on site A2 (Cinema) and ask that this be continued along Bedford Wharf, and applied wherever possible in the centre, including the Portsmouth Road Car Park.

The designation of much of this area is as “Strategic Employment Site (Office and Research and Development); as above this town centre area may not be suitable for R and D which often requires spacious layout and a low density employees.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3709  Respondent: 8561377 / The Guildford Society (Julian Lyon)  Agent:

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

A2. Guildford Cinema, Bedford Road, Guildford – we understand the rationale for the amended wording here but we do consider that GVG’s plans for the riverside are vastly superior and would create a fine addition to the town.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2670  Respondent: 8575585 / Ian Macpherson  Agent:

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

A2: Guildford Cinema, Bedford Road

This i potentially a major development site of some significance, more particularl y because the owner of the ‘Casino’ building adjacent to Bridge Street is reportedly very interested in redevelopment also. The total site –Cinema, ground level car park, ‘Casino’, is of some significance in itself.M ore importantly, it bridges between the Railway Station and The Friary, which is an entry point to the town centre as a whole. Decades ago, the then planners idefined the need for a high level routefrom the Station to the town, removing the pedestrian problem s of Bridge Street and the at-level-fi ghts crossing of Onslow Street. The opportunity to have a high level platform of size enough to be an attraction in its own right [ shops, entertainment, and the luxury hotel that Guildford so badly needs] while providing a most attractive route into town [ in contrast to so many walkways], is unique and should be seized. That does not emerge here.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

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

On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.

On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.

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

Attached documents:

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

3.1.1 Sites which are wholly in the flood plain are also within the 1 in 20 year flood plain

We note that these sites POLICY A2 and A6 are designated flood zone 3b developed and have been allocated within flood zone 3b. We acknowledge that Guildford Borough Council have provided reasoning for these site allocations within the evidence base. We do not wish to raise a point of soundness regarding these allocations and leave it for the Inspector to provide their view on this matter.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: psLP172/4812  Respondent: 17484449 / Thames Water Utilities Ltd (Sir or Madam)  Agent: Savills (Richard Hill)
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A2
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Site ID | Site Name | Water Response | Waste Response
--- | --- | --- | ---
| | | | |
On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.

On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.

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

**Attached documents:**

Total records: 6.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Policy A3 - Land between Farnham Road and the Mount, Guildford
## Commentary

### Case 1

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/8278  **Respondent:** 8591041 / Surrey Wildlife Trust (Mike Waite)  **Agent:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document:</th>
<th>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

It is important to retain opportunities for urban Green Infrastructure here.

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

**Attached documents:**

### Case 2

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/977  **Respondent:** 8848033 / Paul Gerrard  **Agent:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document:</th>
<th>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

I object to housing on this site. This is a previously developed site, so makes sense to redevelop it. However, it was not previously used for housing and is within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, and therefore any redevelopment, especially for housing, is subject to EU/UK legislation (NPPF 119). The impact of development cannot be mitigated with SANGs because at present there is no evidence base to support SANGs as required by NRM6 viii, NPPF 158 and 166.

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

**Attached documents:**

### Case 3

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6875  **Respondent:** 8926241 / Amanda and Nigel Baines  **Agent:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document:</th>
<th>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

The topography of the site will indeed require ‘innovative design’. The construction process for this site will cause some considerable disruption to not only the neighbouring residents but also to the flow of peak time traffic. Disturbance of any kind travels some considerable distance through chalk; I pity the poor souls living in these homes as they will feel every tremor from the passing trains. Innovative design does not come cheap and very few private developers are prepared to swallow the costs which may well impact on the quality, appearance and sustainability of the build.

C3 classifications state that up to six people living together in one unit, be they a family or requiring care, suggests overcrowding on an awkward site. C3 also allows people with dementia and mental health problems to be accommodated here. It is well known that sufferers of either of these conditions never thrive in enclosed and noisy areas with the condition often worsening. A site on top of an extremely busy railway station is absolutely not an appropriate place to house such poor individuals.

A legal agreement preventing residents of these homes applying for parking permits whilst essential to safeguard existing residents parking in the immediate vicinity, is inadequate. Whilst the residents of the proposed site may not be allowed to park legally, there is nothing to stop them from owning a car and parking wherever they wish. The parking wardens
struggle because there are not enough of them to keep on top of the parking problems now. Seventy homes with multiple occupancy equals 140 cars at a conservative estimate. This is a concern especially as it is highly unlikely any of the public transport system proposals will be in place beforehand in order for this development to be truly car free.

Limited vehicular access for refuse and removal trucks is interesting. No mention is made as to where this might be which is worrying. Farnham Road is busy with both traffic and pedestrians, the Mount is narrow and also very busy with limited access and visibility for traffic going up and down the hill. In addition, there are two schools with St Nicolas children in particular at risk.

Pedestrian access from the Mount would require pedestrians gaining access from this busy rat run onto the side of the road without a pavement. A highly dangerous situation. Plus heavy rainfall transforms that side of the Mount into an ankle deep torrent of water. This is not a problem that will lessen any time soon. There is potential for many an accident especially if the occupants of the new site are elderly or struggling with mental health problems.

The relaxation of the s52 agreement simply gives developers a green light to do as they so wish. They will not retain ‘valuable trees where possible’. Private developers are not known for retaining any existing flora and fauna at the best of times as has been seen in many recent developments in this area over the last year. A refreshing approach would be to enhance the existing trees and shrubs on the boundary lines as part of the permission to build. To do so will protect the neighbouring properties and soften the somewhat brutal site.

After consideration, I OBJECT to the current proposal.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2788  Respondent: 10533057 / David Martland  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A3

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

It is hard to see how the NPPF objectives of sustainable development are going to be achievable with sites in areas which will more or less mandate car usage, and where alternative forms of transport are not always good. Any developments on the Wisley site will probably create significant transport requirements which will be difficult to satisfy as although changes have been made to local stations to accommodate longer trains, I believe it will be hard for the train operators to provide a significantly enhanced service with the greater capacity commensurate with the size of developments which might be proposed. Besides, sustainability does not mean that most people have to be commuters travelling into London, or occasionally Guildford and other locations. Other public transport in the areas around Horsley, Wisley and Effingham is currently rather poor, and subject to erratic change on a year by year basis. For example, the route into Horsley and Effingham (bus 479) was for a short period via Horsley, Effingham Junction and Bookham stations, thus making travel to and from stations easier. That only lasted a short while, and the current route for that bus now only travels via Bookham station, thus reducing the usefulness of bus as a mode of transport. Bus services are poorly used, but there is a chicken and egg situation, as if the buses don’t go where people need to travel, they will find other means, such as using private cars. Taxi provision in some areas of Guildford borough is expensive and not always reliable. There could usefully be some revision of how taxis operate. Many private taxi firms will charge high rates for local journeys, perhaps to discourage such journeys, as presumably journeys to the airports at Heathrow and Gatwick are more profitable.

While much of the plan is at a high level, I noted one detail at a consultation meeting. Many residents of areas such as Horsley and Effingham are now over 60 years of age, and have some mobility problems. Some are chronic, while others are temporary – for example after having had operations for hips, knees etc. Those older members of the community who do still try to travel by train can have difficulty at stations such as those at Horsley and Effingham Junction due to the need to cross the line by a footbridge, and there are no lift or other facilities to improve the situation for them. Indeed the advice for wheelchair users at Effingham going to London is to take the train to Guildford, then take the train back to
London – to avoid crossing the line. This is really unacceptable. At Horsley it would be possible to improve the access to the station on the up-side (north of the railway bridge) by a footpath, which would allow rail travellers to reach the platform without having to go over the bridge, and a relatively easy slope would make that possible. Such changes and improvements to infrastructure could enable local residents to remain in their homes for longer, which might overall represent a more efficient use of houses and other facilities than creating pressure on them to move elsewhere or into care homes before they really feel the need to.

I hope that my comments regarding the revised plan will be taken into account.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7121    Respondent: 15629025 / Surrey County Council (Sir or madam)    Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A3  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )  
Policy A3 Land Between Farnham Road and the Mount Page131  
The access should be from The Mount for refuse and removal/service vehicles only, although it is recognised that this would have significant impact in terms of tree cover, gradients, and the need to remove much of the existing wall on the north side of the carriageway. If the site were to be car free (which Surrey County Council supports), and given that there is currently no vehicular access to the A31, it is not apparent what improvements/ or re-build of Farnham Road Bridge the development should be liable for. Land may be required for a re-build of Farnham Road Bridge and this might need to be secured from the site.  
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?  
Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1734    Respondent: 17285857 / Network Rail (Daniel Chalk)    Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A3  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )  
Policy A3: land between Farnham Round and the Mount, Guildford  
As stated in the requirements there is a signal box on the site so it is important that any aspirations to develop the site take account of the Wessex Route’s plan for re-controlling all signalling into the Basingstoke ROC.  
Network Rail are currently working closely with Guildford Borough Council to specify and remit a study that will look at all railway land requirements around Guildford to ensure that sufficient land is available to provide the infrastructure to meet growth and demand on the railway (potentially in the form of additional platform capacity).  
This study will help to ascertain the land available for development and is an important example of how Network Rail is working closely with our stakeholders to identify land that can be utilised to meet the needs of the railway and the wider community.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4838  Respondent: 17484449 / Thames Water Utilities Ltd (Sir or Madam)  Agent: Savills (Richard Hill)

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A3

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Water Response</th>
<th>Waste Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42306</td>
<td>A3 - Land between Farnham Road and the Mount</td>
<td>We have concerns regarding Water Supply Capability in relation to this site. Specifically, the water supply network in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. It will be necessary for us to undertake investigations of the impact of the development and completion of this will take several weeks. It should be noted that in the event of an upgrade to our assets being required, up to three years lead in time will be necessary. In this case we ask that the following paragraph is included in the Development Plan. “Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate water supply capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing water infrastructure.”</td>
<td>On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Attached documents:

Total records: 7.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Policy A4 - Telephone Exchange, Leapale Road, Guildford
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Comment ID: pslp172/3719  Respondent: 8561377 / The Guildford Society (Julian Lyon)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4

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

A4. Deleted – Telephone Exchange, Leapale Road, Guildford – We had hoped this site could be included in the Local Plan (even if it was aspirational and represented extra homes over and above the housing target). We understand the lease expires in 2025 and BT may need to identify an alternative (or smaller) facility nearby. The Local Plan should help to facilitate this. The quantum of development, if emulating Printing House Square but, perhaps with an additional floor or two, could in reality, accommodate 150 homes.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4343  Respondent: 8561377 / The Guildford Society (Julian Lyon)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4

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

We had hoped this site could be included in the Local Plan (even if it was aspirational and represented extra homes over and above the housing target). We understand the lease expires in 2025 and BT may need to identify an alternative (or smaller) facility nearby. The Local Plan should help to facilitate this. The quantum of development, if emulating Printing House Square but, perhaps with an additional floor or two, could in reality, accommodate 150 homes.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2397  Respondent: 8598785 / Mr Roger Parslow  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4

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

I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan

- Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.

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

Attached documents:
Comment ID: pslp172/2219  Respondent: 8729313 / Lisa Wright  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4

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

I object to this BROWNFIELD, town centre site being deleted from the Local Plan as it could provide homes for many of our young people.

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

reinstate the site and utilise this area for crucial homes.

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1034  Respondent: 8731649 / Ian Slater  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4

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

I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan

Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2425  Respondent: 8796481 / Sally Erhardt  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4

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

I object to the removal of Brownfield sites A4 from the plan – this site in Guildford is appropriate for housing and would be supported by the sustainable infrastructure of a large town. This site should be used for housing, not commercial retail.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3903  Respondent: 8817537 / Kim Meredith  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3935</th>
<th>Respondent: 8828385 / Thomas Meredith</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan | Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.  
Site A44 in Broadford Business Park has also been removed. This is another brownfield site that has already been developed. The Council’s claims to “have adopted a ‘brownfield first’ approach” (page 5) but this is clearly not the case, and is contrary to national guidelines. | |
| What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? | Attached documents: | |
| Comment ID: PSLPS16/978  | Respondent: 8848033 / Paul Gerrard | Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A4 | Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( No ) | |
| I object to housing on this site. This is a previously developed site, so makes sense to redevelop it. However, it was not previously used for housing and is within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, and therefore any redevelopment, especially for housing, is subject to EU/UK legislation (NPPF 119). The impact of development cannot be mitigated with SANGs because at present there is no evidence base to support SANGs as required by NRM6 viii, NPPF 158 and 166. | | |
| What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? | Attached documents: | |
| Comment ID: pslp172/2492  | Respondent: 8854785 / Desmond McCann | Agent: |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) | | |
Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.

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

Attached documents:
I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan

Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2895  Respondent: 8911873 / Tamsin Meredith  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan

1. Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.

2. Site A44 in Broadford Business Park has also been removed. This is another brownfield site that has already been developed. The Council’s claims to “have adopted a ‘brownfield first’ approach” (page 5) but this is clearly not the case, and is contrary to national guidelines.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4252  Respondent: 8914049 / Diana Bridges  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan

Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3671  Respondent: 8926529 / Annie Cross  Agent:
| Comment ID: | pslp172/1026   | Respondent: | 9009153 / Lindsay Mitchell   | Agent: |
| Document: | Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? | ( ), is Sound? | ( ), is Legally Compliant? | ( ) |
| **Policy A4 – Telephone Exchange** |
| 1. I object: to the removal of 100 homes from a sustainable location in the centre of Guildford. This will put pressure on other sites to take up the slack. |
| What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? |
| Attached documents: |

| Comment ID: | pslp172/1783   | Respondent: | 9241793 / Nicky Wilson   | Agent: |
| Document: | Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? | ( ), is Sound? | ( ), is Legally Compliant? | ( ) |
| I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan |
| Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail, thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable. |
| What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? |
| Attached documents: |

<p>| Comment ID: | pslp172/1162   | Respondent: | 10616321 / Petrina Jeffreson   | Agent: |
| Document: | Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? | ( ), is Sound? | ( ), is Legally Compliant? | ( ) |
| 1. I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan |
| Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable. |
| What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? |
| Attached documents: |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4212</th>
<th>Respondent: 10638209 / Wendy Rockhill</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1671</th>
<th>Respondent: 10701537 / Ben Gamble</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1106</th>
<th>Respondent: 10731937 / Carol Mullan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I strongly object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan

Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail — thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.

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

Attached documents:

---

1. I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4 and A44) from the Plan

Faced with an excess of housing planned for the Ripley area I am unable to understand why site A4 in Guildford has been removed from the Plan. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail — thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.

Site A44 in Broadford Business Park has also been removed. This is another brownfield site that has already been developed. The Council’s claims to:

“have adopted a ‘brownfieldfirst’ approach” (page 5)

but this is clearly not the case, and is contrary to national guidelines.

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

Attached documents:
I strongly object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan
Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly suitable housing site within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development. This proposal is totally unacceptable.

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

Attached documents:
I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan
Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.

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

Attached documents:
I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan

Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1089</th>
<th>Respondent: 11039681 / Bruce Jeffreson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan

Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2151</th>
<th>Respondent: 11043425 / Melinda McLean</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan

Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/5101</th>
<th>Respondent: 11048481 / Patrick Oven</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OBJECTION TO THE REMOVAL OF BROWNFIELD SITES, A4, GUILDFORD TOWN CENTRE AND A34, BROADFIELD BUSINESS PARK, SHALFORD.

I OBJECT to the removal of these site from the Local Plan. The Council claims to adopt a brownfield first policy. Policy A4, the former Guildford telephone exchange, is now proposed to be used for commercial retail rather than as before, housing. This clearly suggests the Council is failing to properly implement government policy to use brownfield sites first, before going for previously undeveloped land.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2363  Respondent: 15064673 / Steven Yadav  Agent:

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

I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan

Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2358  Respondent: 15081505 / Victoria Yadav  Agent:

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

I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan

Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2308  Respondent: 15114721 / Leslie Macnair  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan

Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.

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

Attached documents:
I think it unfortunate that this brownfield site is no longer to be developed for homes. Town centre accommodation of the sort outlined here would have been useful to provide sociable housing - a mixture of council-owned and privately owned homes that serve the community by being harmoniously mixed. Sorry to see this lost and wondering why it was. Would BT simply not sell the land?

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3251  Respondent: 15312769 / Norah Johnson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4

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

I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan

Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable. The amount of empty shops in Guildford, especially at the top of the High Street would surely be a good reason not to increase the retail provision in the town centre.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3396  Respondent: 15388641 / Eva Hay  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4

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

I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan

1. Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.

2. Site A44 in Broadford Business Park has also been removed. This is another brownfield site that has already been developed. The Council’s claims to “have adopted a 'brownfield first’ approach”(page 5) but this is clearly not the case, and is contrary to national guidelines.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1244  Respondent: 15406145 / Paul Moore  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan

Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which, I believe, is totally unacceptable.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2276  Respondent: 15432705 / Gordon Bennett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4

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

I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan

Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1559  Respondent: 15434433 / James Collins  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4

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

I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan

Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3956  Respondent: 15442561 / Tegan Meredith  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4
I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan

1. Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.

2. Site A44 in Broadford Business Park has also been removed. This is another brownfield site that has already been developed. The Council’s claims to ‘have adopted a ‘brownfield first’ approach’ (page 5) but this is clearly not the case, and is contrary to national guidelines.

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

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to removal of sites A4, Telephone Exchange and A18, Guildford College as they would provide 200 homes in sustainable location, and 100 homes at A33, Broadford Business Park.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4024  Respondent: 15585345 / Wanita Styles  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan

Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2192  Respondent: 15585793 / Mark Horigan  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan

Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2554  Respondent: 15590849 / Nigel Freebody  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to removal, in the revised 2017 Local Plan, of a number of brown field areas in the A4 and A34 sites. This has and will continue to place undue pressure for the further destruction of Green Belt land to fulfil the growing need for additional housing.

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

Attached documents:

---

8. I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan

Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.

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

Attached documents:

---

Policy A4: Telephone Exchange, Leaple Road, Guildford Page 133

This site would provide an excellent opportunity for use as a bus station, being mid way between Waitrose, the expanded North Street site, and North Street.

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

Attached documents:

---

We have concerns regarding Water Supply Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the water network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing water infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed water supply strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is
sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.

We have concerns regarding Water Supply Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the water network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing water infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed water supply strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.

The proposed 100 dwellings exceed the capacity trigger levels for available network. Developer funded impact study required to understand implications of development.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1097  
Respondent: 17241889 / John Hackney  
Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4

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

I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan

Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1205  
Respondent: 17247169 / Ben Greaves  
Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4

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

I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan

Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail - thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1257  Respondent: 17249601 / Penelope Moore  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4

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

I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan

Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which, I believe, is totally unacceptable.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1360  Respondent: 17256577 / Tina Makin  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4

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

I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan

Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1909  Respondent: 17291553 / James Hitchings  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4

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

I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan

Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1974  Respondent: 17293025 / Donna Deam  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4

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

I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan

Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2267  Respondent: 17302497 / F Bennett  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4

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

I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan

Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2321  Respondent: 17303745 / Christine M Macnair  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4

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

I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan

Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2372  Respondent: 17304865 / A Cruse  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4

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

1. I strongly object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan

Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. Why? This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2503  Respondent: 17316257 / Neeley Jackson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4

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

I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan

Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable. It is nonsensical to not use a space that is already allocated as brownfield at the expense of greenbelt.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2592  Respondent: 17325665 / Claire Nix  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4

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

I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan

Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has
removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2776  Respondent: 17357249 / E Turner  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4

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

I object to removal of brownfield sites A4 and A34. The council has not adopted a ‘brownfield first’ approach

I therefore strongly object to all proposed development A34, A43, A58, A42 on the grounds that the area will be grossly overcrowded causing urban sprawl. The roads are already at maximum capacity. One small breakdown occurrence in area causes vast traffic jams. I also object to the fact that the Guildford Borough Council ignored the thousands of objections from the Send/Ripley area and instead increased the allocation of housing etc.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2929  Respondent: 17373505 / Paul Beach  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4

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

I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from the site in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is an unacceptable trade off.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3080  Respondent: 17383969 / Maureen Mitchell  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4

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

I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan:

Site A4 has been removed. This is within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure and would make use of a brownfield site in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from the site in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is an unacceptable trade off.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3179   Respondent: 17399681 / Anthony Smith   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4

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

It is wrong in principle to remove Brownfield sites (A4 and A34) from the Plan. To comply with national guidelines, such sites should be developed first before consideration is given to greenfield sites.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3327   Respondent: 17406209 / Guildford Vision Group (Andrew Black)   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4

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

POLICY A4 - Telephone Exchange, Leapale Road, Guildford

4.11 It is noted that this site has now been removed as an allocation within the Local Plan. The reason stated within the summary of changes is that the site is no longer available but the reason for this is not clear.

4.12 It is understood that the lease of the current occupier will expire by 2025 which is within the lifetime of the proposed Local Plan. It is the position of GVG that this site remains a suitable site for housing and should be considered for CPO by GBC if no longer available. The communications infrastructure contained within the site could be relocated as part of any redevelopment of this site or as part of the adjoining North Street development.

4.13 Alternatively the building could be converted into residential use with the limited amount of communications equipment remaining in place.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/5102   Respondent: 17407745 / Lilijana Howells   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4

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

I object to removal of sites A4, Telephone Exchange and A18, Guildford College as they would provide 200 homes in sustainable location, and 100 homes at A33, Broadford Business Park.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3415</th>
<th>Respondent: 17412193 / Beryl Evans</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site A4 has been removed. This is within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure and would make use of a brownfield site in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from the site in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is an unacceptable trade off.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3894</th>
<th>Respondent: 17434049 / Lucy Starke</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to removal of Brownfield sites (A4) from the Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable. The amount of empty shops in Guildford, especially at the top of the High Street would surely be a good reason not to increase the retail provision in the town centre.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4223</th>
<th>Respondent: 17462657 / Malcom Scott</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to removal of brownfield sites (A4) from the plan: Site A4 in Guildford has been removed. This is a perfectly good housing site, within the town centre and therefore with sustainable infrastructure, and would make use of a brownfield site that is in need of redevelopment. The Plan has removed housing from this site, in favour of commercial retail – thereby effectively substituting Green Belt land for retail development, which is totally unacceptable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total records: 75.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: Policy A5 - Jewsons, Walnut Tree Close, Guildford
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3788</th>
<th>Respondent: 8561377 / The Guildford Society (Julian Lyon)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A5</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A5. Jewsons, Walnut Tree Close, Guildford –

We are not sure how the boundary of the site marries up with the Sustainable Movement Corridor and the extension of Station View. There may be some scope to introduce a little more height on this gateway site, but the configuration of development has been somewhat stymied by the Taylor Wimpey development recently completed next door. Access to the pedestrian and cycling corridor is noted and welcomed.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1190</th>
<th>Respondent: 8729313 / Lisa Wright</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A5</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the Eastern edge of this site alongside the railway line should be saved for a road to access the Station car park, thus taking traffic away from the gridlocked Walnut tree Road

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2224</th>
<th>Respondent: 8729313 / Lisa Wright</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A5</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The amount of homes can be increased on this BROWNFIELD site, 175 is not enough.

May I suggest a direct 'back route' to the station to keep traffic and pedestrians away from Walnut Tree Close?

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/979</th>
<th>Respondent: 8848033 / Paul Gerrard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A5</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to housing on this site. This is a previously developed site, so makes sense to redevelop it. However, it was not previously used for housing and is within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, and therefore any redevelopment, especially for housing, is subject to EU/UK legislation (NPPF 119). The impact of development cannot be mitigated with SANGs because at present there is no evidence base to support SANGs as required by NRM6 viii, NPPF 158 and 166.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7769  Respondent: 11832961 / The National Trust - London and SE (Rachel Botcherby)  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A5

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

In addition to the requirements listed in the draft policy, the Trust would expect the policy to require the scale and design of any new buildings on this site to have regard to the setting of the River Wey Corridor and we request the policy be amended accordingly.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1172  Respondent: 15239169 / First Regional Estates Ltd (Daniel Goldberg)  Agent: GL Hearn Limited (Paul Woods)

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A5

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

Our client, First Regional Estates Ltd, is the owner of the Jewsons builders’ merchant site, Walnut Tree Close in Guildford town centre, part of which is the subject of a proposed residential allocation for approximately 125 homes under Policy A5.

The Jewsons site is a regular shaped site in a highly accessible location being situated on the edge of the town centre, a short distance from Guildford railway station. The site was first identified in the Council’s Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (2014) under site ref: 1107 as suitable for residential development, although it is was also noted that there was a possibility of redeveloping to provide a mixed use to include new homes and employment. The site was subsequently identified as a site allocation in the Council’s draft Local Plan Strategy and Sites Consultation (Regulation 18) which took place over a 12 week period from 1 July 2014. Identified as site 29, the allocation referred to ‘Housing (C3) and/or office (B1a)’. The commentary indicated that the site is situated in a sustainable location close to the station and that there was potential to incorporate commercial office use as part of a residential led mixed use scheme.

For the reasons set out below, we consider that there should be flexibility on the potential uses of the site to include in addition to residential use, the potential for student accommodation and the potential for an element of commercial space including office, retail/restaurant or leisure use as part of a mixed use scheme. We also consider that the indicative housing number of 125 homes underestimates the development potential of the site.
As set out in our comments on Policy A10, in the absence of certainty on the deliverability of the sustainable movement corridor scheme the subject of A10, we also consider that the Policy A5 site allocation should be extended to include the strips of land in our client’s ownership to the west and north currently the subject of the site allocation under Policy A10. This would provide for an enlarged site area of 0.73 hectares to accord with the site allocation 29 within the Council’s previous Draft Local Plan Regulation 18 consultation.

Potential Uses

We welcome the Council’s acknowledgment that the site is suitable for residential development. However, in light of the site’s central and sustainable location close to Guildford town centre, Guildford University and the railway station, we consider that the site would lend itself to a range of potential uses and we would ask that this is reflected in the policy with reference in particular to the site having flexibility to provide residential or student accommodation with the potential for an element of commercial floorspace including office, retail/restaurant or leisure uses.

With respect to potential commercial uses, the potential of the site for commercial offices was previously recognised by the Council at least in part and commercial offices are being developed as part of a mixed use scheme to the south of the site at 1 & 2 Station View. Central government policy set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012) indicates at paragraph 23 that local planning authorities should, inter alia, allocate a range of suitable sites to meet the scale and type of retail, commercial, office, tourism, cultural, community and residential development needed in town centres and that it is important that needs for retail, leisure, office and other main town centre uses are met in full and are not compromised by limited site availability. Demand for such space will play a factor, however our client wishes to retain the flexibility at this stage.

With respect to student housing, we consider that the site represents an ideal location for such development having regard to its location. Not only is it located close to the town centre and railway station, but also the main University of Surrey Stag Hill Campus is situated a short distance away from the site on the other side of the railway line accessed via Yorkie’s bridge.

Policy H1 (Homes for All) of the Council’s Submission Draft Local Plan indicates that new residential development is required to deliver a wide choice of homes and meet a range of housing needs as set out in the Council’s latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). With respect to students, the draft policy notes that the Council will expect 60% of the University of Surrey eligible student population (full time equivalent) to be provided with student bed spaces and accommodation on campus.

Consideration of student housing need is contained at Appendix C of the West Surrey SHMA (September 2015). This sets out predicted growth in student numbers over the plan period and notes that currently University accommodation only meets the needs of 52% of eligible students. With the expected increase in student numbers as noted in the SHMA, there will be increased pressure on the University to provide student accommodation and off site provision conveniently located for the University Campus would assist in meeting this need and in turn would release pressure on the general housing market, particularly the less expensive rented sector.

The site has the flexibility to meet the demand for the above range of uses. We would ask that this flexibility is reflected in the site allocation rather than the site being restricted to a single use.

Density of Development

We consider that the allocated provision of approximately 125 residential units underestimates the development potential of this edge of town centre site, particularly having regard to its proximity to the railway station.

Policy H1 of the Submission Draft Local Plan indicates that new residential development is required to make the most efficient use of land whilst responding to local character, context and distinctiveness. The policy describes how
residential densities will vary dependent upon the local area context and character and sustainability of the location. It is noted that higher density development will be supported in Guildford town centre. Supporting paragraph 4.2.8 indicates that there is a responsibility to use natural resources, such as land, wisely and that efficient use of land is essential. The paragraph describes how increasing densities can help reduce the land needed for new homes and make development more sustainable and can also help support facilities and services. This is particularly important for a town like Guildford which is surrounded by Green Belt and where there is invariably development pressure on green field sites.

Paragraph 17 of the NPPF sets out 12 core planning principles which it indicates should underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. These include encouraging the effective use of land by reusing land that has previously been developed; promoting mixed use developments; and actively managing patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling and focusing significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable.

The Government consulted on proposed changes to national planning policy in the NPPF over the period 7 December 2015 to 22 February 2016. One of the topics the subject of consultation was increasing residential density around commuter hubs. Paragraph 14 of the consultation document indicates that there are significant benefits to encouraging development around new and existing commuter hubs, thereby reducing travel distances by private transport, making effective use of private and public sector land in sustainable locations, and helping to secure the wider regeneration and growth of the local area. It is noted in the paragraph that in this context the Government is keen to support higher density housing development around commuter hubs to help meet a range of housing needs. Paragraph 15 indicates that the Government is proposing to change national planning policy to require local planning authorities to require higher density development around commuter hubs wherever feasible. The Government is proposing that a commuter hub is defined, inter alia, as a public transport interchange (rail, tube or tram) where people can board or alight to continue their journey by other public transport (including buses), walking or cycling. Whilst this policy approach has yet to be incorporated into national policy, it is a clear statement of intent on the part of Government to increase residential densities around commuter hubs.

Having regard to the above, Policy A5 should be looking to maximise the potential of the site having regard to its sustainable location. It is clear that Guildford Station falls within the definition of a commuter hub as noted above and the site is situated within easy access of the station. The indicative housing number for the site of 125 homes based on a plot of 0.64 equates to a residential density of 195 dwellings per hectare. We consider this underestimates the development potential of the site.

In particular, we refer to the residential led mixed use scheme (incorporating offices) immediately south of the site at 1 & 2 Station View, which is the final stages of construction under outline planning permission ref: 06/P/02309 and reserved matters approval ref: 09/P/01965 with subsequent minor alterations under variation of conditions permission ref: 14/P/01614. This development provides for 177 dwellings on a site of 0.5 hectares equating to a residential density of 354 dwellings per hectare. Furthermore, the scheme at 1 & 2 Station View provides for 1,837 sqm of B1 office floor space in addition to the residential floor space.

The Council’s planning committee report in relation to the outline planning permission ref: 06/P/02309 for the scheme at 1 & 2 Station View in consideration of density indicated that the site is highly sustainable and therefore it was appropriate to seek a high density, although it was noted that a balance needs to be made between making best use of limited urban land and ensuring that any development integrates with the surroundings through a design lead approach.

The Jewsons site and the site at 1 & 2 Station View sit within a similar urban context. If one was to apply the same density to the draft site allocation under Policy A5 as that accepted by the Council at 1 & 2 Station View, based on a site area of 0.64 hectares a potential redevelopment scheme could give rise to 226 residential units with potential for some additional commercial space as part of a mixed use scheme. Based on a larger site allocation of 0.73 hectares incorporating the strips of land to the west and north of our client’s site, a potential redevelopment scheme could give rise to 258 units plus some commercial uses. We would recommend that the proposed density for the Policy A5 site is more aligned to the density of development at 1 & 2 Station View acknowledging that it is a guide to development and actual form and scale of development will be determined through a design lead approach.

Having regard to the above, we consider that the current wording of the policy is unsound on the basis that it is inconsistent with national planning policy. Also, the extent of the allocation and current drafting of the policy is not
justified when considered against reasonable alternatives and is not effective in making the best use of the site at an appropriate density. It is also not flexible enough to allow for a suitable range of town centre uses.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2683  Respondent: 15239169 / First Regional Estates Ltd (Daniel Goldberg)  Agent: GL Hearn Limited (Paul Woods)

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A5

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

We submitted comments to the proposed submission draft version of the Local Plan on 18 July 2016 in respect of Policy A5 (Comment ID PSLPS16/1150) on behalf of our client, First Regional Estates Ltd, which is the owner of the Jewsons builders merchant site. Our comment on the opportunity to incorporate the provision of a shared pedestrian/cycle route through the site has been partly addressed, however the Council has sought to keep Policy A10 in respect of the strip of land to the north of our client's site to which we maintain our objection (see our response to further amendments to Policy A10).

We maintain our objections to the other elements of Policy A5 as set out in our original representations. We also now object to the following further amendments.

Under Requirements paragraph (2), reference is made to ‘...having regard to the Sustainable Movement Corridor Supplementary Planning Document’ (SPD). We understand from the Council’s Planning Policy team that this SPD has yet to be produced even in draft and will not be produced until after work on the preparation of the Local Plan is complete. We consider that the draft Local Plan is unsound in making reference to, and placing justification on, a SPD that does not currently exist.

Paragraph (3) introduces a new requirement that vehicular access to the site will be from Station View. Our client strongly objects to this new requirement on the basis that restricting vehicular access from Walnut Tree Close as part of any redevelopment of the Jewsons site would serve to restrict the options and flexibility for redevelopment and so undermine the site's redevelopment potential. Access from Station View is secondary access to the site and Station View is not adopted highway. In our view, it is difficult to see how vehicular access from Walnut Tree Close to serve a single development site in this location (which would have the benefit of additional access from Station View) would give rise to traffic generation levels which would undermine the Council’s aspirations for a sustainable movement corridor in this location. On this basis, we consider that the restriction on vehicular access is unnecessary and is unsound.

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

We maintain our original objections to the submission draft Local Plan. With respect to the proposed further amendments, we recommend deletion of ‘...having regard to the Sustainable Movement Corridor Supplementary Planning Document’ under paragraph (2) and deletion of paragraph (3).

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7835  Respondent: 15674273 / Savills for Thames Water (Katherine Jones)  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A5

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
We have concerns regarding Water Supply Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the water network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing water infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed water supply strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.

We have concerns regarding Wastewater Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.

The proposed 125 dwellings exceed the capacity trigger levels for available network. Developer funded impact study required to understand implications of development.

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

Attached documents:
POLICY A5 - Jewsons, Walnut Tree Close, Guildford

4.14 GVG supports the development of this key site and the quantity of housing allocated on the site. However GVG identifies the potential for this site to accommodate 132 dwellings in addition to an enhanced medical centre which can serve both the existing community, university campus and the predicted increase in local population.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Water Response</th>
<th>Waste Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42298</td>
<td>A5 - Jewsons, Walnut Tree Close, Guildford</td>
<td>The water network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Strategic water supply infrastructure upgrades are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. The developer is encouraged to work Thames Water early on in the planning process to understand what water infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered.</td>
<td>The wastewater network capacity in this area may be unable to support the demand anticipated from this development. Local upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are may be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a potential wastewater network capacity constraint, the developer should liaise with Thames Water to determine whether a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered is required. The detailed drainage strategy should be submitted with the planning application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Attached documents:
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A6 - North Street redevelopment, Guildford
As well as (or as part of?) its consultation on the proposed Amended Local Plan, Guildford Borough Council is also consulting on the future of Guildford’s Friary Bus Station and alternative options as part of its plans to regenerate the ‘North Street Quarter’.

As a significant commercial bus operator in the Guildford area carrying in excess of 850,000 passengers per annum I write to explain our position concerning the options tabled by SYSTRA on behalf of Guildford Borough Council in March 2017 (report released 28 June 2017). This is highly relevant to the Local Plan.

Unleashing the Potential for Bus-based Public Transport in Guildford

With an estimated 7.5 million bus journeys[1] already being made annually in Guildford we believe that bus-based public transport has a vital role in supporting Guildford’s economy, addressing traffic congestion[2] and improving air quality, particularly in the Town Centre, and therefore that generous provision should be made for it, particularly within the heart of the Town.

This will be even more critical if further development of Guildford, as suggested in the draft Amended Local Plan, is to proceed without causing significantly greater amounts of traffic congestion and worsening air quality.

Bus networks are very flexible and responsive and consequently lead times for improvements can be fairly short. In contrast to other modes, investment in bus services is generally not expensive – and is capable of delivering relatively quick returns.

However, to be commercially viable and appealing to existing customers and current non-users alike, bus-based public transport must be more convenient than using the car.

Crucially this means that buses must be able to use direct, quick and efficient routes into and around the Town Centre and be able to drop off and pick up customers very close to where they want to get to. The vast majority of passengers wish to access the heart of the Town Centre which is why the location of current bus station is so appreciated.

These views are absolutely consistent with the tenor of ARUP’s Technical Note on Existing Conditions Commissioned by GBC and SCC dated 27 May 2016, the Guildford Town Centre and Hinterland Masterplan Report by Allies and Morrison (October 2015) and comments by Councillor Paul Spooner (as Leader of the Council), former Managing Director Sue Sturgeon and Councillor Matt Furniss[3]. The fact that, at 7.4%, Guildford already has a higher bus mode share than the national average (5%) suggests that there is already a solid (if small) base to build on.

Guildford cannot continue to grow and compete with other retail and employment centres without providing more sustainable and attractive means of accessing and moving around its Town Centre. Attractive-to-use bus-based public transport will, of necessity, play a key role in facilitating this as there is very limited scope to increase other modal provision in the short to medium term.

In summary, we believe that buses should be seen as the solution and not the problem and we would encourage you to think similarly.

Critique of the Options Tabled by SYSTRA on behalf of GBC

Neither SYSTRA’s Primary Option (relocation of stops to Leapale Road/North Street with some additional layover at Bedford Wharf) or the Secondary Option (relocation of stops to Leapale Road/North Street and provision of layover at
Bedford Wharf along with some bus departure bays) will allow buses to fulfill their true potential. SYSTRA’s report on the stakeholder engagement exercise makes this quite clear. Consequently, we cannot support either Option as they stand.

Specifically, both Options would result in buses serving points South, West and North of Town (services in the latter two directions being the most frequent and heavily used) not being able to drop off and pick up customers and workers close to where they want to get to without significantly increased journey times which will reduce the appeal of the bus service to existing and potential bus users and increase operating costs. **Terminating services at Bedford Wharf without first accessing the heart of the Town Centre is not an acceptable alternative.**

Rather than facilitate the exciting vision outlined above, we believe that the resulting extended bus service routings will deter large numbers of existing and potential users from using the bus as their mode of travel to the Town Centre because a key selling point – that of convenient access to the heart of the Town – will be seriously eroded for the majority of passengers. Reduced bus use, together with increased operating costs, will result in higher fares and/or reduced frequency of service (impacting disproportionately on the more marginalized in society who are more dependent on bus services to access jobs and other facilities) and/or increase the call on scarce public funds through a greater need for bus service support.

We therefore consider that there is a real danger that the Options - as currently drafted – could cause bus transport to become marginalized and increasingly a mode of necessity rather than one of choice, reversing current positive patronage trends.

Failure to embrace the opportunity – already being taken by many towns and cities across the UK[4] – to harness the potential of buses to support sustainable economic growth in Guildford and its environs would be a huge opportunity missed to help address Guildford’s chronic traffic congestion and poor air quality[5]. This is because provision of excellent public transport as a viable and attractive alternative to the car would allowing a greater degree of restraint on car use to be considered politically, socially and economically acceptable, thereby helping to achieve the modal shift which is so often talked about when considering how to release Guildford’s town centre from the ‘vice-like grip’ of unfettered traffic volumes and congestion and make it a more attractive place to live, work, shop and relax.

**What We Propose**

Our natural preference would be the re-provision of a modern state-of-the-art central Bus Station as part of the North Street Quarter development, for example at the south end of a widened Leapale Road with excellent bus and passenger access via Leapale Road and the whole length of North Street.

However, we are not entirely dismissive of the concept of the relocation of stops to Leapale Road/North Street and provision of additional layover at Bedford Wharf along with some bus departure bays (effectively a hybrid of SYSTRA’s Primary and Secondary Options) but, **crucially, to make this work we additionally require that:**

- **bus access to, and customer facilities in, the whole length of North Street is provided** in order that:
  1. buses serving the South, West and North of Town and beyond can follow a direct, quick and efficient route into and around the Town Centre viz North Street, Leapale Road, Onslow Street;
   1. there is sufficient opportunity for buses to drop off/pick up customers in the heart of the Town Centre and have adequate opportunity for recovery time between journeys to ensure service reliability **without buses on high frequency routes having to travel to the proposed Bedford Wharf bus layover facility** as this would not be operationally or commercially viable;

- **all other through vehicular traffic is removed from the whole of North Street and Leapale Road** so that these roads become more pleasant environments for pedestrians, create space for buses and other sustainable modes and assist bus network reliability.

It is vital to appreciate that a central bus station and/or allowing buses to access the whole of North Street **will not undermine the viability of the proposed redevelopment of the North Street Quarter**. Rather it will **enhance** its...
viability (and that of the Town Centre as a whole) by allowing buses to bring large numbers of customers and workers close to these places and play an increasing part in resolving the chronic traffic congestion (and consequent unpleasantness evidenced by poor safety, air quality, pedestrian connectivity and visual intrusion) which is currently blighting the Town Centre, thereby making Guildford an increasingly desirable place to live, work, shop and relax.

In order to help create an attractive and sustainable Town Centre which is not blighted by traffic we also believe that:

- Bridge Street should be dedicated solely to buses, pedestrians and cycles (plus very limited vehicular access to premises) travelling in both directions following removal of the Gyratory system in order to speed up bus journeys (both in actual terms and viz-a-viz the car), allow better bus/rail interchange close to the main entrance of Guildford Railway Station and making Bridge Street a more pleasant and safer environment for pedestrians and cyclists;

- car parking provision should largely be located just outside the central core of the Town (e.g. Millbrook, Bedford Road[6], Guildford Park Road etc), as opposed to right in the centre (e.g. on-street in North Street, Leapale Road multi-storey car park, Portsmouth Road surface car park[7]). Much more emphasis should be placed on directing motorists, especially long stay and contract permit holders, to the Town’s Park & Ride facilities[8], all of which have spare capacity. This would help to remove traffic from the central core which would reduce congestion and visual intrusion, increase space for sustainable transport modes, improve safety and air quality and allow more public spaces and living streetscapes to be created;

- vehicular deliveries to Town Centre premises must be strictly limited to those times which do not interfere with peak travel demand or retail activity;

- provide additional road infrastructure, in particular an additional river/road crossing, to relieve the Town Centre and the existing Gyratory area and resolve the propensity of the A3 bottleneck to cause widespread congestion throughout the Town[9].

**Bus Routings**

Allowing buses to access the whole of North Street (as opposed to just the part east of Leapale Road) is essential to provide direct, quick and efficient bus services into and around the Town Centre for customers arriving from/departing to all points of the compass.

Inability to access (lower) North Street would result in buses (hence passengers) having to undertake a significant detour, presumably via York Road and (narrow) Chertsey Street to reach (upper) North Street and Leapale Road. This would add significantly to journey times and operational costs and reduce customer appeal.

A ‘sustainable modes only’ Bridge Street could also be served by buses using the proposed Sustainable Movement Corridor (SMC).

We have drafted provisional bus routings and recommendations for bus passenger infrastructure which we would be happy to discuss with you.

---

**Reciprocal Commitments from Bus Operators**

In exchange for excellent access into the heart of a relatively traffic-free Town Centre and provision of high quality bus stands as described above Safeguard Coaches would be pleased to discuss:

- an Enhanced Partnership arrangement (as provided for in the new Bus Services Act) between themselves, Guildford BC, Surrey CC and other stakeholders to promote bus-based public transport, achieve high standards of bus service reliability and coordinate initiatives (including common ticket products for the Guildford area);

- minimum bus service levels, including during evenings and Sundays/Public Holidays;
• even more attractive fares for young people and maximum adult/child fares according to distance travelled, M-ticket and contactless payment options;

• improved customer WiFi on all buses;

• minimum environmental standards of vehicles used in shared spaces (primarily Bridge Street, North Street and Leapale Road) by specified dates; and

• excellent staff training/management/control of driver behaviour when navigating shared spaces[10].

Summary

Safeguard Coaches absolutely believe buses have a central part to play in helping to resolve the issues facing Guildford and in particular its Town Centre and maintains that, without excellent provision for this form of transport, the Council’s vision for an expanding Guildford (as indicated in the proposed Amended Local Plan) will not be realizable.

However, we cannot support either the options which were the focus of SYSTRA’s stakeholder consultation exercise on commercial and operational grounds and have already raised concerns over the impact of the proposals on the ability of Guildford’s bus network to support and enhance Town Centre retail and leisure activity, access to job opportunities, traffic congestion etc.

While our first preference would be a new, high quality bus station of the same size as the current facility built as part of the North Street Quarter, we think that other solutions could work and have developed exciting and workable ideas which have the potential to meet the requirements of both bus passengers and operators, in particular bus facilities in the heart of the Town Centre (where most people want to go) and quick and reliable access to them.

Re-provision of a central bus station and/or allowing bus access the whole of North Street will not undermine the viability of the proposed redevelopment of the North Street Quarter but rather will enhance it by allowing them to bring large numbers of customers and workers directly to it.

Key to success in this regard will be restraint on car use in the Town Centre through:

• implementation of a ‘drive to, not through’ policy for general traffic;
• removal of through vehicular traffic from the central area and restrictions on deliveries;
• relocating car parking to edge-of-centre locations;
• greater use of existing Park & Ride facilities, especially for long stay and contract parking;
• provision of additional road infrastructure to relieve the Town Centre road network.

We urge the Council to be ambitious in its aspirations to create a Town Centre that we and our children can be proud of and believe that, in this context, bus-based public transport will be able to help deliver much needed improvements in terms of connectivity, sustainability, air quality, safety and social inclusion at an affordable price and in a realistic timescale.

Safeguard Coaches urges GBC to engage meaningfully with us and the Town’s other principal bus operators and existing/potential bus passengers in a spirit of true partnership such that the very best solution for Guildford can be found and implemented. For our part, we are prepared to work with other stakeholders to achieve that outcome but will not accept ‘watered down’ versions.

I trust that this letter provides a helpful synopsis of Safeguard Coaches’ position, in particular making quite clear that we cannot support the proposals as currently tabled by SYSTRA but suggesting that there are other really exciting and more sustainable solutions available while offering to work in partnership with Guildford Borough Council and other stakeholders to deliver bus-based public transport that Guildford can be proud of.

[1] Information provided by Laurie James, Passenger Transport Section, Surrey County Council.
Recent research by traffic monitor Inrix has revealed Guildford to be the most congested town in the country, only exceeded in this respect by the cities of London, Manchester, Aberdeen, Birmingham and Edinburgh (Surrey Advertiser, February 2017).

Matt Furniss: ‘Improvements to the bus services are key to achieving a modal shift in the town’ (Surrey Advertiser, 24 March 2017), ‘We remain committed to encouraging sustainable, integrated transport and quality passenger facilities’ (Surrey Advertiser, March 2017).

According to Bus Users UK many towns and cities have seen significant growth in bus passenger numbers through highly-visible bus services that operate in close proximity to the main shopping areas.

Poor air quality is particularly evident around the Gyratory and its approaches.

Bedford Road car park could be linked to the Town Centre by a new larger and iconic pedestrian bridge across Onslow Street. Millbrook car park could be double-decked.

Save for a small element of premium-priced short stay parking and provision for Blue Badge holders.

Oxford, York and Winchester are great examples of how effective such a strategy can be. Winchester Crown Court will only refund jurors’ Park & Ride fees, not Town Centre car parking fees, thereby positively encouraging jurors not to drive into the centre of the City. We also recommended increase in town centre parking charges. We consider that reduced revenue from car parking will be more than compensated by the many benefits arising from parking policies designed to reduce town centre congestion and land take.

Ideally by a tunnel.

Evidence from other towns (High Street in Exeter, Fleet Street in Torquay, South Street in Worthing and Terminus Road in Eastbourne are good examples) would suggest that allowing bus access to otherwise largely pedestrianized zones can be achieved without compromising safety while enabling a much-improved streetscape.

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

Attached documents:

Comments:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8107  Respondent: 8556385 / Guildford Residents Association, EGRA (Amanda Mullarkey)

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

A6: North Street redevelopment

Need to allocate land for an attractive all-direction bus interchange

Question mix of housing and retail

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4270  Respondent: 8556385 / Guildford Residents Association, EGRA (Amanda Mullarkey)

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A6
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Question mix of housing and retail

Remain concerned at extent of proposed expansion of retail floor space Delete minimum retail requirement. Could be residential and high tech hub.

Research shows millennials buy online and want a retail experience that requires less retail and stock floor space.

Welcome caveat re bulk but strong concern about bulk and massing and loss of bus interchange with no appropriate facility or alternative location being identified.

Sustain objection – loss of bus interchange

Need to allocate land for an attractive all-direction bus interchange

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4308  Respondent: 8559297 / Holy Trinity Amenity Group (Robert Bromham)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A6

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

P156. “North Street redevelopment”.

Retail (A1) and food and drink (A3 and A4) target space needs to be reduced to allow a quality redevelopment to be obtained, as for P22 above.

- P157. “North Street redevelopment, Transport. Mitigation measures, including those achieving modal shift to sustainable modes of transport, to accommodate the increased travel demand from the development, and changes to the town centre network for private traffic, deliveries, and buses”

Add. Key routes across the site for pedestrians and cyclists are to be adopted by the Highways Authority to ensure they are an integral part of the town’s network.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3789  Respondent: 8561377 / The Guildford Society (Julian Lyon)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A6

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
North Street Redevelopment, Guildford – The Guildford Society is engaged with the developers and the Council in discussions around this important strategic site. We are concerned about the allocation of uses and areas when compared to the total stated need for the town. We welcome a successful development of this site and we have already articulated our concern that the future of retailing is by no means assured, the GVA generated from retail trails far behind other uses, and there is a need to ensure the development is successful. We would be keen to see a policy direction that looks towards space that can easily be brought into alternative uses – particularly a greater amount of residential use. The use of some of the development to displace the Odeon cinema would help to increase the overall amount of residential development in the town centre. We have already stressed that retail development has a low GVA. A principal concern on this geographically-constrained site is difficult traffic access. The amount of retail development proposed, some 39,000 sm, is close onto 40% of current retail and far too great for an already constrained town centre. More specifically, the retail forecast used is based on a Consultant’s report by Carter Jonas which has four basic flaws.

1. the retail data used is national data which ignores Guildford’s access problems.
2. internet shopping has had a huge growth in Guildford and many shops have closed.
3. the plan itself does not appear to take into account the existence of an already well-established retail centre (The Guildford Society recognises this and urges the Council to assess the impact, which it does not appear explicitly to have done).
4. finally, and most important this is a retail forecast for private development to the exclusion of other uses and assuming land is plentiful for all competing uses rather than constrained as it is in Guildford town centre. Guildford, in our judgement, needs a much better-balanced solution with housing and town centre employment playing a much larger part.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1191  Respondent: 8729313 / Lisa Wright  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A6

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

OBJECT to over allocation of retail space. more affordable homes needed instead.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2228  Respondent: 8729313 / Lisa Wright  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A6

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

I object to the amount of retail and office space this site has been allocated. Retail is in demise and Guildford still has empty shops in the Friary, High Street and North Street.

I object to the huge increase in Food outlet space which is very unnecessary as we have a very nice offering of restaurants and fast food outlets already. If built, could force some of our top, independent restaurants out of business.

I object to the low amount of housing this site offers. Surely, with such a high housing target, Guildford should be utilising these brownfield sites for homes. I estimate that at least 1000 sustainable homes could be provided in this town centre site.
Comment ID: PSLPS16/980  Respondent: 8848033 / Paul Gerrard  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A6

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

I object to housing on this site. This is a previously developed site, so makes sense to redevelop it. However, it was not previously used for housing and is within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, and therefore any redevelopment, especially for housing, is subject to EU/UK legislation (NPPF 119). The impact of development cannot be mitigated with SANGs because at present there is no evidence base to support SANGs as required by NRM6 viii, NPPF 158 and 166.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2236  Respondent: 8893697 / Gill Woolfson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A6

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

Objection to Policy A6; North Street development.

GBC has failed to plan proactively for the 21st century when proposing 45,000 sq m of new retail space and has not recognised the role that residential development can play in ensuring the vitality of a town centre.

I object that 45,000 sq m is being set aside for increased retail space in Guildford Centre.

Internet shopping now accounts for 13% of all purchases nationally, up from 3% in 2007. Tesco, Sainsburys and Morrisons are all making losses. Austin Reed is closing its shops this month. The British Retail Consortium anticipates that thousands of stores and 1m jobs will be lost by 2025.

Guildford has been successful in maintaining retail capacity in the past. However, it will be shaped in future shaped by the forces that are changing high streets everywhere: the internet, a decline in clothes shopping and more money being spent on experiences and sport. It is not planning for the 21st century. Its assumption that it will continue to maintain and increase shops is flawed. Has there been much interest in this site from developers?

This space could more profitably be used to fulfil the Government’s and GBC’s commitment to building sustainably on brownfield sites and using residential property to boost the vitality of town centres. GBC is only planning to build just 1,300 homes in the town centre. The town centre is where many people would like to live.

NPPF 20 and 23 points 1 & 9 refer

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

Attached documents:
3.23 M&G supports the proposed allocation of the North Street site for a comprehensive mixed use redevelopment with an additional 45,000 sq m of retail comparison floorspace. However, it objects to the insufficient quantum of food and drink and residential being proposed.

3.24 In compliance with policy S2 optimum use of the North Street site should be proposed. Policy A6 presently proposes 45,000 sqm comparison retail floorspace and 3,000 sqm food and drink (A3) and drinking establishments. M&G believes that the site could and should facilitate a larger amount of food and drink floorspace. This is particularly important if new leisure uses such as a cinema and cultural uses are to be realised as these uses will need to be supported by an increased offer in food and drink to assist with commercial viability.

3.25 A number of case studies highlight where else a higher food and drink floorspace has been adopted with positive outcomes. The Council’s own evidence base document (the Carter Jonas Retail and Leisure Study) states:

“3.26 Leisure uses make an increasingly important contribution to the vitality and viability of town centres and shopping centres, as they provide complementary uses that contribute to both the daytime, early evening and night-time economies.

3.27 Since the early 1990s the commercial leisure sector has experienced significant growth fuelled by buoyant market conditions, growing levels of disposable incomes and low unemployment. During the 1990s this growth mainly occurred in edge and out-of-centre leisure and retail parks, and was usually characterised by large multiplex cinemas and a range of other facilities (including tenpin bowling, bingo, nightclubs, health/fitness clubs, themed destination restaurants, pub/restaurants and budget hotels). However, the tightening of planning policy has resulted in leisure facilities being integrated more into town centre mixed use developments.

3.28 Although the commercial leisure sector has not been immune from the impact of the economic downturn, the latest development trends indicate a move towards leisure-led schemes with multiplex cinemas as important anchors in their own right, along with related catering uses. This is illustrated by the Trinity Leeds scheme where the amount of space allocated to leisure, eating and drinking increased over time to almost one-quarter of the centre’s total floorspace. Other leisure-led schemes include the proposed extensions/refurbishments of Centrale in Croydon and Silverburn in Glasgow by Hammerson, which comprise a new cinema and restaurants. The extension to The Walnuts in Orpington also includes a mix of cinema, restaurants and retail, as do the proposals for new leisure-led schemes in Ealing and Hounslow town centre.”

3.26 In addition to the importance of leisure uses in the schemes highlighted by Carter Jonas’ study, the Westgate scheme in Oxford (see Annex 1) provides for just under 30 per cent of the centre’s total floorspace being allocated to food and drink and leisure uses. Similarly, the proposed West Quay Watermark scheme (see Annex 2) provides for complete flexibility in allocating A1, A2, A3 and A4 uses up to 19,550 sq m plus 19,500 sq m of leisure.

3.27 In contrast Policy A6 provides for just 3,000 sq m of food and drink uses (A3 and A4) and no other leisure uses alongside the allocation of 45,000 sq m of retail (A1). This represents just under 7 per cent of the proposed centre’s total floorspace. This figure is very low by comparison with the schemes referred to above, especially as the North Street scheme is also proposing to include a substantial amount of residential development.

3.28 In response, M&G proposes that Policy A6 be amended to provide for the following quantum of uses:

“45,000 sq m retail (A1), 6,000 sq m food and drink (A3 and A4) and 30,000 sq m of residential (up to 400 units of studios, 1 bed, 2 bed and 3 bed)”
3.29 The provision of 6,000 sq m of food and drink uses (A3 and A4) represents around 13 per cent of the retail proposed and is considered the minimum necessary to deliver a quality shopping experience for visitors and residents. Should a cinema be incorporated within the scheme then additional A3 and A4 together with D2 uses would be required.

3.30 The wording in relation to the bus interchange is supported and is in contrast to the wording used in paragraph 4.4.18 of the Local Plan which suggests that the bus station is replaced on site.

3.31 With these changes in place M&G considers that the proposed North Street redevelopment would have a much better prospect of being realised and, in turn, the Council’s Vision for the Town Centre.

Transport
We believe that replacement bus facilities should be provided off site.

3.32 The reference to the need to fund new bus interchange facilities (BT1) by developer contributions is noted. As indicated in the representations above, the North Street scheme does not have scope to fund a replacement bus station.

Summary
We believe that, with the recommended changes outlined above, the Local Plan policies would be sound and legally compliant.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4294  Respondent: 9335041 / David Reeve  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A6
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Partly SUPPORT / partly OBJECT (on 3 distinct grounds)

- I support the larger number of residential dwellings to be constructed on this site.
- I acknowledge the reduction in planned retail space, but I nevertheless object because I do not believe that the proposed reduction is sufficient, owing to the large structural changes in the retail market arising from internet shopping and home deliveries.
- The Plan is extremely equivocal on the detail of what is intended for the bus station. A Plan is not a plan if it does not clearly articulate what the future is going to be.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/385  Respondent: 10798049 / Steve & Maureen Knight  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A6
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Support - more affordable and social housing needed
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3930  Respondent: 10989761 / James Walsh  Agent:

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

Policy A6 (p.156) and Spatial Vision (p.22) While I broadly support the plans for the North Street regeneration, I am concerned that the amount of space allocated for food and drink has doubled from 3,000 sq m to 6,000 sq m in the latest iteration of the plan. Like many towns, Guildford already has an abundance of restaurants and fast food shops and I would like to see a more imaginative use of this space – boutique shops, studio space and space for independent traders, for example.

I am also concerned about the addition of 200 flats to the 200 earmarked in the 2016 version of the plan – the town centre should not become the repository of all the high-density housing in the borough and a balance needs to be struck with the villages and other urban areas. I am concerned about the traffic and parking implication of such a high number of flats concentrated in the town centre – and it is not advisable to consider ANY developments as “car-free” options, as most people will continue to use cars to travel.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7123  Respondent: 15629025 / Surrey County Council (Sir or madam)  Agent:

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

Policy A6 North Street Page 137

The following comments refer to text included under the heading “Requirements” under the relevant underlined sub headings as follow:

Bus Interchange - The principle of re-locating the bus station/ provision of an interchange elsewhere in the town, has not yet been established through the current study which has not yet reported.

Transport – We would like to see included as a separate bullet point, “Full assessment, and implementation of mitigation measures to accommodate the increased travel demand from the development, and changes to the town centre network for private traffic, deliveries, and buses.”

Assessments - There is a need to include a separate bullet point, “Transport.”

Key Considerations - There is a need to include “Transport/infrastructure” as a separate bullet point.

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

Attached documents:
We have concerns regarding Water Supply Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the water network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing water infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed water supply strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not tounder estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.

We have concerns regarding Wastewater Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not tounder estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.

The proposed 200 dwellings and other development exceed the capacity trigger levels for available network. Developer funded impact study required to understand implications of development.

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

Attached documents:

3.1.1 Sites which are wholly in the flood plain are also within the 1 in 20 year flood plain
We note that these sites POLICY A2 and A6 are designated flood zone 3b developed and have been allocated within flood zone 3b. We acknowledge that Guildford Borough Council have provided reasoning for these site allocations within the evidence base. We do not wish to raise a point of soundness regarding these allocations and leave it for the Inspector to provide their view on this matter.

POLICY A6: North Street redevelopment, Guildford.
The local plan policy requirement (13) states: ‘Avoid development of high or medium vulnerability uses in flood zone 2 (medium risk) and flood zone 3 (high risk)’. This should read ‘more or highly vulnerable uses’.

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

Attached documents:
M&G strongly supports changes to the policy to confirm an increase in the allocated number of homes and increased A3 food and drink and A4 drinking establishment floorspace within the site. It is considered that these changes are soundly based taking into account the location and capacity of the site, and the latest evidence of need for new homes and leisure provision in the town centre. They reflect current and longer-term trends in the changing mix of successful town centre uses. M&G supports the flexible wording of these policy provisions in that no minimum floorspace or unit provision is required.

Whilst not objecting to the 400 home limit in principle, it is suggested that this be worded with allowance for flexibility in the event that small increases in the total number of homes are proposed. It is recommended that the wording be adjusted to say up to “approximately” 400 homes, or “about” 400 to avoid policy conflict in the circumstance where, say, a 410 unit scheme comes forward and other relevant policy requirements for the site are met.

There are a number of other new changes to Policy A6 that present significant concern to M&G from a planning and project delivery perspective. M&G objects to the following changes, which are not soundly based.

i. The expression of the allocated comparison retail floorspace provision as a minimum.

This change reduces the flexibility of the policy approach and could, potentially, threaten the deliverability of a project given market changes over the plan period or changes in other key commercial parameters including whether or not an anchor tenant is secured. Notably, land assembly is required to deliver the full site allocation project. In the event that full land assembly is not achieved the ability to meet a policy compliant minimum retail floorspace within a residual land area would be challenging.

Whilst it is recognised that the 2017 retail and leisure study addendum suggests that up to date forecast comparison retail growth requirements are less than predicted by the previous study, the report is strongly caveated that capacity forecasts carried out over a long period of time are inherently less certain and should be treated with caution. In practice comparison retail need forecasts could increase or reduce during both the plan period and beyond for a variety of economic reasons and therefore a flexible policy approach is necessary to reflect this. M&G requests that the comparison retail floorspace allocation for the site is expressed as an approximate figure (with 45,000 sq m gross as previously included in the policy being reflective of M&G’s current draft redevelopment proposals).

It is recognised that proposals for this long-term project will need to be accompanied by a retail impact assessment to justify the proposed floorspace quantum in the context both of other existing provision in the town and of Guildford’s position as a centre competing with other town centres sub-regionally. This offers another check to demonstrate that the quantum of floorspace coming forward in a scheme is appropriate.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) para 14 states that local plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change. Paragraph 21 requires policies to be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan and to allow a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances. NPPF paragraph 157 further identifies that it is crucial for plans to promote the flexible use of land. Accordingly it is an unsound approach for the plan to apply a strict minimum floorspace quantum requirement in the policy.

ii. The specific policy requirement for provision of one gym (D2) use

The Guildford Retail and Leisure Study Addendum, February 2017 considers forecast need for new commercial leisure provision, focusing on cinema, food and beverage, and fitness and leisure provision. Opportunities for additional cinema screens (new/expanded cinema facility in Guildford town centre) is identified together with the potential need for two branded gym facilities, again with demand likely to be focused on Guildford town centre.
M&G supports the provision of one or more D2 assembly and leisure uses as part of a successful mixed use North Street redevelopment, but considers that policy should be worded more flexibly to encourage D2 uses (such as a gym provision) that broaden the offer of the town centre, rather than policy being prescriptive about a specific D2 use for the site. As currently drafted the policy requirement is inflexible, potentially stifling opportunities for alternative or innovative complementary commercial leisure provision that can support a successful scheme for Guildford.

iii. Unnecessary design requirements

Items (2) and (5) of Policy A6 are unnecessary, involving substantial overlap and duplication with the content of Policy D4 character and design of new development.

Whilst M&G does not object per se with the requirements of (2) and (5) relating to site context, street pattern, heritage and views, the content of (3) on scale of development should be removed. An appropriate scale and mix of development can be considered through pre-application discussions, environmental impact assessment, proposed mitigation measures, and the determination of a planning application. Policy requirement (3) is clumsily worded and unworkable, and fails to recognise the role of viability in determining a deliverable mix of uses or the need for flexibility in a period of changing market conditions and retail trends.

Other comments on Policy A6

The use of floorspace figures in the policy needs clarification.

It is recommended that all retail/commercial floorspace figures are expressed in the policy as square metres on a Gross Internal Floor Area (GIFA) basis as defined by the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors. M&G has used this form of measurement for the purposes of its draft North Street development scheme.

To improve the policy and for the purposes of soundness we recommend the following varied wording for the policy as a whole. Note that this includes a suggested small tweak to the flood risk wording to comply with national guidance:

**POLICY A6: North Street redevelopment, Guildford**

**Allocation**

The site is allocated for a comprehensive mixed use redevelopment with:

- Approximately 45,000 sqm (gross internal) additional comparison retail floorspace
- Approximately 6,000 sqm (gross internal) additional food and drink (A3) and drinking establishments (A4)
- 400 homes (approx.) (C3)
- Provision of (D2) assembly and leisure use floorspace, such as a gym

**Requirements**

**Office provision**

(1) A minimum of 5,500 sq m (gross) of existing office (B1a) floorspace will be retained.

**Design, vitality and connectivity**

(2) Development to comply with Policy D4 on the character and design of new development, responding to the context set by the surrounding street pattern and historic environment, including the adjacent Conservation Area. Particular care to be given to massing, heights, views in and out of the site, and roofscapes.
(3) Design to enhance and respond to the existing historic shopping core and;
   o Improve connectivity with High Street and lanes, and
   o Improve underused areas, and
   o Improve the public realm

(4) Mix day and night time uses to add to vitality of area

(5) 24 hour access to public streets and squares

**Bus interchange**

(6) Bus interchange facilities presently provided at Guildford bus station on the site are to be provided in a suitable alternative arrangement to be located partly or wholly off site

(7) On-street provision of bus stops and waiting facilities within the town centre will be designed to facilitate interchange between bus services and to be integrated with other town centre activities.

**Transport**

(8) Stopping up of Commercial Road and Woodbridge Road (between North Street and Leapale Road) and Traffic Regulation Orders affecting the roads surrounding the development will be necessary including changes to Leapale Road, Onslow Street and North Street to create more pedestrian space and to facilitate the movement of buses.

(9) The development will be designed to maximise opportunities for sustainable transport given its central location that promotes walking, cycling, bus and train use. By integrating transport with car parking provision, the number of car journeys will be minimised in favour of sustainable modes.

**Flood risk**

(10) Achieve flood risk betterment, appropriate mitigation and flood risk management, and have regard to the recommendations of the Level 2 SFRA

(11) Avoid development of ‘highly vulnerable’ or ‘more vulnerable’ uses in flood zone 2 (medium probability of river flooding) and flood zone 3 (high probability)

**Assessments**

(12) To be determined at planning application stage, but including;

   (a) Retail impact assessment

   (b) Environmental impact assessment (EIA)

**Opportunities**

(1) This site offers a major opportunity to reinforce Guildford’s comparison retail offer, provide town centre housing, improve the leisure offer of the town centre, to create new squares and streets, and to improve the appearance of North Street

(2) Help to reduce flood risk in the local area
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

See attached document which includes proposed updated wording for the policy.

Attached documents: 170721 M&G reps Guildford Local Plan 2017.pdf (252 KB)

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2791  Respondent: 17359777 / The Guildford Society (Julian Chair)  Agent:

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

ALLOCATION A6

North St Retail Development. We have already stressed that retail development has a low GVA. A principal concern on this geographically-constrained site is difficult traffic access

The amount of retail development proposed, some 39,000 sm, is close onto 40 % of current retail and far too great for an already constrained town centre. More specifically the retail forecast used is based on a Consultant’s report by Carter Jonas which has four basic flaws.

1. the retail data used is national data which ignores Guildford’s access problems.
2. internet shopping has had a huge growth in Guildford and many shops have closed.
3. the plan itself does not appear to take into account the existence of an already well established retail centre (The Guildford Society recognises this and urges the Council to assess the impact, which it does not appear explicitly to have done).
4. finally and most important this is a retail forecast for private development to the exclusion of other uses and assuming land is plentiful for all competing uses rather than constrained as it is in Guildford town centre. Guildford, in our judgement, needs a much better balanced solution with housing and town centre employment playing a much larger part.

[these paragraphs should sit at the end of our A6 comments]

I hope this is self-explanatory

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3333  Respondent: 17406209 / Guildford Vision Group (Andrew Black)  Agent:

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

POLICY A6 - North Street redevelopment, Guildford

4.15 This is a key site for Guildford Town Centre and GVG supports the redevelopment for a range of uses. It is noted there have been four separate failed schemes by MEPC, Hermes, Westfield and Land Securities respectively. It is clear that the successful redevelopment of the site, as envisaged by GBC for decades now, is highly dependent on securing a main anchor tenant. Discussions have been ongoing for some time with John Lewis. It is clear from recent publicly available information that John Lewis, and indeed many anchor retailers, are unlikely to open any additional stores at
present (appendix 8) beyond those identified already. The site should be developed with town centre uses but not subject to overdevelopment.

4.16 It is noted that the proposed 41,000 sq m of comparison retail floorspace and 6,000 sq m of food and drink is the same as the forecast for the total borough-wide floorspace capacity for comparison shopping and food and beverage uses as set out at para 4.40 in the Retail and Town Centre Topic Paper up to 2030. The current proposals for this quantum of retail space and 400 dwellings appears to be overdevelopment of the site; when the allocation claims the total retail allocation for the borough. The town centre masterplan will require retail and leisure accommodation at ground floor to create the appropriate quality of environment. This site has not, to date, been included in the GVG Masterplan as it was considered to be at an advanced stage of development. With the likely absence of a major department store and question marks over the site, the site should be redesigned and masterplanned to contribute to needs of an integrated town centre.

4.17 It is therefore considered that GBC needs to consider alternative schemes for this site, including its capacity for more housing, in order for the site allocation to be considered as sound. It is also considered that this is a more suitable site for the relocation of the cinema from site A2.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Water Response</th>
<th>Waste Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42294</td>
<td>A6 - North Street Redevelopment, Guildford</td>
<td>The water treatment capacity in this area may be unable to support the demand anticipated from this development. Minor infrastructure upgrades may be required to ensure sufficient treatment capacity is available to serve this development. Thames Water would welcome the opportunity to work closely with the Local Planning Authority and the developer to better understand and effectively plan for the water treatment infrastructure needs required to serve this development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: Water Treatment Works upgrades can take 18 months to 3 years to design and build</td>
<td>The wastewater network capacity in this area may be unable to support the demand anticipated from this development. Local upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are may be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a potential wastewater network capacity constraint, the developer should liaise with Thames Water to determine whether a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered is required. The detailed drainage strategy should be submitted with the planning application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Attached documents:
Total records: 20.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A7 - Land and buildings at Guildford railway station, Guildford
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8108  Respondent: 8556385 / Guildford Residents Association, EGRA (Amanda Mullarkey)  
Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A7 

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

A7 Land at Guildford railway station 

Important to avoid overdevelopment and limit the height of development 

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3790  Respondent: 8561377 / The Guildford Society (Julian Lyon)  
Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A7 

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

Land and Buildings at Guildford Railway Station, Guildford – We note the reference to the Sustainable Movement Corridor and we consider the station needs to be interlinked to all bus services, not only those using the SMC. We do not understand why the reference to the River Wey Conservation Area has been removed. We would wish to see a more ambitious overall view of the railway station and its surroundings including the land at Policy A8, Policy A3 and Policy A11. 

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2672  Respondent: 8575585 / Ian Macpherson  
Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A7 

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

A7 and at Guildford railway station, 

This account is limp. 

The major contribution to a key transport interchange appear to be the replacement of Walnut Tree river bridge. It is not entirely clear how necessary this is, since the present serves reasonably. The real problem on the route to town is the Onslow Street at-level-lights pedestrian crossing –see commentary on A2 above for resolution. Meanwhile, there is no discussion of the potential for interchange with the buses or kiss-and-ride. This is a once-for-all opportunity for serious benefit to the town, and needs positive planning.


OXFORD STATION proposals have, I understand set an outstanding example of what can be done by way of a combined approach from all relevant parties.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1192  Respondent: 8729313 / Lisa Wright  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A7

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

OBJECT, room for a road along the eastern edge for traffic to station needs to be incorporated.

OBJECT- no need for so much retail.

OBJECT- not enough housing

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7907  Respondent: 8834689 / of NLP Ltd c/o Solum Regeneration (Dennis Pope)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A7

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

First, we note that the extent of this allocated site (Policy A7) broadly reflects the SRG site and that that the land to the west of Guildford Station is, appropriately, the subject of a separate site allocation (Policy AB).

As a matter of principle SRG supports the proposal for the "Comprehensive mixed use development" on its Station site....incorporating "improved transport and interchange facilities"

Policy A7 states that mixed use redevelopment is to include "approximately 350 homes (C3), 500 sqm of comparison retail, 700 sqm of convenience retail and 1,500 sqm of Class A3 and 1 gym (D2 use), but the evidence underpinning this is unclear beyond the derivation of these figures from estimates in the LAA.

The SRG planning application proposes 438 homes, 3,642 sqm of station retail/financial & professional/ food and drink and leisure floorspace (Class A1/A2/A3/Sui Generis and D2 uses) as well as 2, 104 sqm of office space (B1 use).

However,

The 350 dwelling capacity has been arrived at from the application of a range of suitability, availability and achievability factors, including a consideration of the site by planning officers, in the 2016 Land Availability Assessment. The LAA also, inappropriately identifies the delivery of this draft allocation within the next 6-10 years, when there is a reasonable prospect that the site will be

fully redeveloped within the 0-5 years period of a Local Plan adopted in earlier 2018.
Given the need to make efficient use of land (draft Policy H1 and Policy A7 'Opportunities') and noting the preferred location for new homes is on most sustainable locations making the best use of previously developed land including within Guildford Town Centre (Spatial Vision/Policy S2), we consider that the SRG site, informed by the design-led approach of the SRG application scheme, has the potential to provide circa 425 to 450 dwellings.

We concur that the improvements to the station and its interchange facilities should include improvements quantitative and qualitative improvements to the associated retail offer, as well offices and assembly and leisure uses, as part of a comprehensive redevelopment. However, whilst the amount of additional floorspace is appropriate for the station location on the edge of the town centre, there is no evidence to support the scale of each element in the Council's 2014 Retail and Leisure study evidence base.

We consider therefore that Policy A7 should be amended to more closely align with the residential capacity potential of this site and that the 'Allocation bullets' be amended to read:

- Improved transport and interchange facilities,
- Approximately 450 homes (C3),
- Additional retail (convenience and comparison) and food and drink offer, and
- Additional complementary offices and assemble & leisure uses.

There is only an opportunity to do so through the site's redevelopment. This site allocation should recognise that the delivering of significant station improvements will be funded through the commercial redevelopment whose viability will be affected as a consequence.

We also consider that the soundness of Policy A7 requires the 'Opportunities' section explain that the improvement of the station infrastructure at Guildford Station, consistent with the Infrastructure Schedule contained at Appendix C which specifically includes "Guildford rail station capacity and interchange improvements", will be funded through the commercial redevelopment whose viability will be affected as a consequence.

Finally, the last bullet point under Requirements section, seeking to avoid development within zone 2, is unnecessary given the preceding flood risk requirements. It should therefore be deleted.

We consider the above amendments to Policy A7 are necessary to render the policy sound.

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

Attached documents:
No substantive changes are proposed to this site allocation other than the deletion of the reference to avoiding development in Flood Zone 2 - this change reflects a factual error and confirms that no part of the A7 site lies with this zone.

However, we note that our other comments on the 2016 PSLP (attached at Annexe 1) have not been taken on board and we remain of the view that these amendments to Policy A7 are necessary to render the policy sound.

Thus, we consider therefore that Policy A7 should be amended to more closely align with the residential capacity potential of this site (i.e. 450 dwellings, rather than 350) and to reflect the ability for the whole of that housing to be delivered in the 'first five years' of the plan (i.e. 2019/20 to 2023/24, rather than the 6-10 years phase).

We also consider that the 'Allocation bullets' be amended to read:

- Improved transport and interchange facilities,
- Approximately 450 homes (C3),
- Additional retail (convenience and comparison) and food and drink offer, and
- Additional complementary offices and assemble & leisure uses.

Finally, we consider that the soundness of Policy A7 also requires the 'Opportunities' section to explain that the improvement of the station infrastructure at Guildford Station, consistent with the Infrastructure Schedule contained at PSLP Appendix C which specifically includes "Guildford rail station capacity and interchange improvements ... [to be] Network Rail and developer funded". Those improvements proposed and funded by SRG, if approved, will be delivered in the first five years, so the time period should be amended to "between 2019 and post 2034" Where such transport and interchange improvements are to be funded through commercial redevelopment, the viability of such development will be affected as a consequence.

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

We also consider that the 'Allocation bullets' be amended to read:

- Improved transport and interchange facilities,
- Approximately 450 homes (C3),
- Additional retail (convenience and comparison) and food and drink offer.
- Additional complementary offices and assemble & leisure uses.

Attached documents:
The Station has been identified as a major gateway to Guildford within the Town Centre Masterplan, with plans already being progressed for new development options. The draft Masterplan document acknowledges that proposals in the river corridor, Station and around Bedford Wharf and North Street will require a clear rationale in relation to building heights, as these sites are highly visible not only from within the Navigations but also across the Navigations from other historic viewpoints. This should be made clear within the site allocations for the station sites.

The National Trust has commented separately on the current proposals for the station (under planning application reference 14/P/02168) and remains concerned regarding the scale and massing of the proposed buildings in relation to the existing three storey buildings (The Billings Warehouse complex) which face the Navigations and which define the visual setting of the Conservation Area. The transition in building heights between the proposed development sites and those existing buildings which at present define the visual setting and context to the Wey Navigation Conservation Area needs further consideration and this draft policy provides the opportunity for the Council to clarify this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7040  Respondent: 15618561 / Howard Klein  Agent:

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

Specifically, the current plan for Guildford Station is an awful “eyesore”, which is out of character for the town.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7837  Respondent: 15674273 / Savills for Thames Water (Katherine Jones)  Agent:

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

Thames Water would welcome the opportunity to work closely with the Local Planning Authority and the developer to better understand and effectively plan for the water treatment infrastructure needs required to serve this development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: Water Treatment Works upgrades can take 18 months to 3 years to design and build.

We have concerns regarding Wastewater Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.

The proposed 350 dwellings and other development exceed the capacity trigger levels for available network. Developer funded impact study required to understand implications of development.
Policy A7: Land and buildings at Guildford railway station, Guildford

This site has previously been included in the Solum property development scheme at Guildford and is currently on hold while the appeal process is carried out following planning permission being denied.

Any plans to develop the site should take account of railway requirements relating to the station building and the need for it to be able to accommodate future growth in passengers. In addition any proposals should also address the permeability of the site from east to west via the footbridge.

Network Rail are developing a scheme to provide a Platform 0 on the east side of the station so it is important that any proposed development does not prevent this scheme from progressing once funding is available.

Network Rail are currently working closely with Guildford Borough Council to specify and remit a study that will look at all railway land requirements around Guildford to ensure that sufficient land is available to provide the infrastructure to meet growth and demand on the railway (potentially in the form of additional platform capacity).

This study will help to ascertain the land available for development and is an important example of how Network Rail is working closely with our stakeholders to identify land that can be utilised to meet the needs of the railway and the wider community.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Water Response</th>
<th>Waste Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48437</td>
<td>A7 - Land and Buildings</td>
<td>The water treatment capacity in this area may be unable to support the demand</td>
<td>The wastewater network capacity in this area may be unable able to support the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>anticipated from this development. Minor infrastructure upgrades may</td>
<td>demand anticipated from this development. Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at Guildford Railway Station, Guildford</td>
<td>be required to ensure sufficient treatment capacity is available to serve this development. Thames Water would welcome the opportunity to work closely with the Local Planning Authority and the developer to better understand and effectively plan for the water treatment infrastructure needs required to serve this development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: Water Treatment Works upgrades can take 18 months to 3 years to design and build</td>
<td>upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are may be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a potential wastewater network capacity constraint, the developer should liaise with Thames Water to determine whether a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered is required. The detailed drainage strategy should be submitted with the planning application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Attached documents:**

Total records: 12.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A8 - Land west of Guildford railway station, Guildford Park Road, Guildford
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2673</th>
<th>Respondent: 8575585 / Ian Macpherson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

A8: Land west of Guildford railway station

This account is limp.

At the present moment, it is understood that comparably as many people exit from this side as the main side. Yet the station facilities are grossly inadequate for the traffic. In particular - and this does touch on matters within GBC control, there is grossly insufficient space along Guildford Park Road for the service buses to pick up or drop off, the taxis to wait [ given the passenger numbers, and the access to different routes from the main station, this facility should be substantially enhanced], and private cars to drop off or pick up. As a result, and with the best will, Park Road is frequently obstructed. As the long term proposals for the University, Science Park, and housing developments appear likely to generate a considerable increase in traffic this needs early addressing, regardless of the issue of expansion of railway operational facilities.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7771</th>
<th>Respondent: 11832961 / The National Trust - London and SE (Rachel Botcherby)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Although on the other side of the railway station, the land levels are such that the scale and massing of new development on this site must also have regard to the impact upon the corridor of the River Wey Conservation Area, as set out above.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7124</th>
<th>Respondent: 15629025 / Surrey County Council (Sir or madam)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Policy A8

**Land west of Guildford Railway station, Guildford Park Road Page 143**
Under “Opportunities” we would like to see included “Provision of a bus / rail interchange on the west side of the railway clear of Guildford Park Road, with other limited facilities”

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1737</th>
<th>Respondent: 17285857 / Network Rail (Daniel Chalk)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A8</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy A8: Land west of Guildford railway station, Guildford Park Road, Guildford**

This site has strong links to Policy A7, particularly in respect to ensuring permeability across the station between east and west sides via the footbridge. As noted in the Local Plan this land has a number of operational uses that will need to be considered in any decision on allocating this site for development.

It should also be noted that the land included in this site could have potential future railway use for additional platform capacity to meet future demand and growth at the station.

Network Rail are currently working closely with Guildford Borough Council to specify and remit a study that will look at all railway land requirements around Guildford to ensure that sufficient land is available to provide the infrastructure to meet growth and demand on the railway (potentially in the form of additional platform capacity).

This study will help to ascertain the land available for development and is an important example of how Network Rail is working closely with our stakeholders to identify land that can be utilised to meet the needs of the railway and the wider community.

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

Attached documents:

Total records: 4.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A9 - 77 to 83 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Comment ID: pslp172/3902  Respondent: 8561377 / The Guildford Society (Julian Lyon)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A9

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

77 to 83, Walnut Tree Close, Guildford - We believe Guildford Borough Council should grasp the nettle with this site by making it a green site fronting the river as a first stage of the linear riverside park. Many of the policy directions, especially A9 Requirements (3) and A9 Opportunities (5) are more consistent with the site being green open space.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1193  Respondent: 8729313 / Lisa Wright  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A9

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

OBJECT. This should be allocated for housing instead. no need for more in town employment offices as we have empty places already

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7772  Respondent: 11832961 / The National Trust - London and SE (Rachel Botcherby)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A9

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

This site abuts the River Wey, towards Dapdune Wharf on the opposite banks of the River. The ‘opportunities’ listed should all form fundamental ‘requirements’ of the policy. In addition to bullet point 3 under ‘opportunities’, more detail on design principles should be included to guide the redevelopment of this site to ensure no adverse impact upon the Conservation Area and setting of the River Wey.

The Trust would seek the following points to be reflected in the policy in respect of the redevelopment of this site:

- Proposals for any increase in building height on existing developed sites adjacent to the Navigations or within the visual setting of the Navigations will be resisted – at this point in the river the character is beginning to become more open and less built up.
- Proposals which bring buildings or other structures closer to the Navigations (unless historical precedent dictates otherwise) will be resisted.
- The redevelopment should deliver increased screening of moving vehicles, parking, loading areas and access roads from the Navigations.
• Proposals for development which are likely to result in an increased risk of flooding or an adverse impact on the water table will be resisted.
• The redevelopment should seek to ensure that existing riverside trees are maintained.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7125</th>
<th>Respondent: 15629025 / Surrey County Council (Sir or madam)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy A9

77 – 83 Walnut Tree Close

Page 145

Under “Opportunities” we would like to see included “Potential facilitation of/ contribution to Sustainable Movement Corridor”

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7838</th>
<th>Respondent: 15674273 / Savills for Thames Water (Katherine Jones)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.

On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2740</th>
<th>Respondent: 17353249 / Walnut Property Investments Limited</th>
<th>Agent: Vail Williams LLP (Jane Terry)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support is generally given to Policy A9 which allocates the site at 77-83 Walnut Tree Close, for offices (B1a) subject to the objections previously made to the policy namely, the limitation placed on the floorspace allocation for approximately 3,000 sq.m where:

- The site currently consists of 37,300sq.ft / 3,470sq.m;
- A further allowance should be made to include a further 400 sq.m in recognition of the potential for redevelopment within the gap between either 77-85 or 97-105 Walnut Tree Close;
- Recognition that it is the design process rather than any arbitrary limitation on the allocation floorspace should be the driver in the redevelopment of this sustainable town centre site. In order to allow sufficient flexibility within the design process the policy should be redrafted to refer to at least the quantum of development currently existing on site plus an additional 400 sq.m for development either within the gap between 77-85 or 97-105; and
- Flexibility in the use should reflect the ELNA findings for the need for ‘B1a and B1b’, Office and Research and Development uses. In addition to the above, it should be noted that:
  - A further building now demolished, was present on site, and which is still referenced on the allocation plan. If this is also taken into account the previous developed quantum would be higher again;

The current buildings are of very poor quality both in terms of the accommodation provided and their impact on the surrounding environmental and amenity value.

For ease of reference, these representations are attached as Appendix A.

Notwithstanding the above, **objection** is raised to the detail of the policy including:

- Limitation of the site’s redevelopment solely for B1 employment use.

As outlined in the objection to the Spatial Vision and Policy S2: Borough-wide Strategy set out above, there is clearly a need for the identification of further sites for sustainably located, residential development. The character of Walnut Tree Close is changing to become much more residentially orientated. Accordingly, and being previously developed, very sustainably located on the edge of the town centre with excellent and acknowledged pedestrian, cycle and bus links, the site at A9 is ideally suited to a mixed use development including up to 70no. 1 and 2 bedroom apartment units. The policy at A9 should therefore be modified to reflect this mixed use potential as follows:

**Allocation:** The site is allocated for approximately at least 3,870 sq. m of mixed use development including residential (C3) and offices (B1a)

Two changes proposed to the text beneath this policy are proposed in terms of:

- An additional requirement - c) Consideration of views in and out of the adjacent River Wey Conservation Area; and to the
- Opportunities:
  (2) Potential facilitation of / contribution to Sustainable Movement Corridor having regard to the Sustainable Movement Corridor Supplementary Planning Document Support; and
  (5) Improve views from Walnut Tree Close to the River Wey and provide pedestrian access through the site to the towpath.

In terms of the additional requirement c) made, the site is currently in B1a and B1c use and is therefore defined as previously developed land. The Policy acknowledges that the site is located within the defined Town Centre and as such is a very sustainably located for new development. Opportunities within the proposed development allocation exist to reduce flood risk in the local area, improve the links along the river and to and from the town centre and improve green infrastructure provision. Above all, the site has significant potential in terms of its redevelopment to improve the character of the surrounding area both in terms of the amenity of adjoining residential occupiers and the character of built fabric and its impact on the setting of the adjoining Conservation Area. However, the site is already very constrained in terms of a restricted curtilage and adjacent residential and commercial development which surround the site on 3 sides and the River Wey on its fourth side. It is recognised that the site has the potential to improve the setting of the Conservation Area through its redevelopment but there are currently no views through the site to or from the River, nor any public right of way
through the site. To require such elements would further limit the site’s potential redevelopment. Consequently, it is important not to further constrain the site by unduly reducing its redevelopment potential and therefore its viability and scope to facilitate the benefits set out above. The additional requirement for ‘Consideration of views in and out of the adjacent River Wey Conservation Area’ is currently not clear in what it is seeking and because it is important to have clarity and not to further limit the site’s potential for redevelopment, requirement c) should therefore be amended as follows:

Requirement c) Consideration of views towards the site from in and out of the adjacent River Wey Conservation Area.

In relation to the proposed amendments to the site’s opportunities:

(2) Potential facilitation of / contribution to Sustainable Movement Corridor having regard to the Sustainable Movement Corridor Supplementary Planning Document Support;

This opportunity would appear to relate to the safeguarding of land for the replacement of Yorkie’s Bridge as part of the Sustainable Movement Corridor Town Centre Phase 2 set out in Policy A10. The site is recognised as being in a very sustainable location which facilitates movement by pedestrians and cyclists. Proposals for a replacement bridge would therefore support the sites existing sustainable credentials. The same statement goes for all other development and redevelopment in the vicinity and there is therefore concern that by highlighting a potential link between policies A9 and A10 as a specific opportunity, a disproportionate burden will be placed on the site’s redevelopment whereas other development allocations should also be factored in. It is therefore suggested that the following changes should be made to opportunity (2):

Opportunity (2) Potential facilitation of / contribution to the site’s redevelopment having regard to the Sustainable Movement Corridor Supplementary Planning Document Support. Accordingly, there is scope to relax the standard of on site car parking requirements which will in turn encourage and facilitate further car free modes of transport.

and

(5) Improve views from Walnut Tree Close to the River Wey and provide pedestrian access through the site to the towpath.

As with the concerns raised against the additional proposed requirements above, there is a need to avoid unduly constraining the site’s redevelopment potential and its ability to secure enhancements for the surrounding properties, occupiers, setting of the Conservation Area and built fabric of the vicinity generally. There are currently no views through the site to or from the River, nor any public right of way through the site. The site is already very constrained. As such it is not feasible to highlight the creation of such elements as a viable opportunity and this should therefore be amended to reflect reasonable opportunities as follows:

Opportunity (5) Enhance views from Walnut Tree Close to the setting of and views from the River Wey Conservation Area and provide enhance the amenity of pedestrian access through the site to along the towpath facilitated by the site’s redevelopment.

Two further opportunities resulting from the site’s redevelopment should be included within the list of Opportunities such that it presents the potential for the provision of high quality, Grade A office accommodation and / or provision of a significant number of small residential units (up to 70no. 1 and 2 bedroom apartments) which would assist with the overall provision of more affordable accommodation for young people as well as the corresponding provision of affordable housing specifically, a longstanding issue acknowledged across both the Borough and HMA; and the enhancement of the urban fabric. Two further opportunities should be added as follows:

Opportunity (7) The provision of high quality, Grade A office accommodation facilitated by the site’s redevelopment.

Opportunity (8) The provision of small residential units which are more affordable for students and young people and the corresponding increase in affordable housing units specifically.
Finally, whilst support is given for the site outline identified in the plan attached to Policy A9 to include the gap between numbers 99 - 103, for clarity this should be reflected in the policy heading:

**Heading to Policy A9 and Policy Plan A9:** Heading to be amended to read:

*Land to the rear of 77 to 83 and between 99 to 103 Walnut Tree Close*

These objections are made on the basis of soundness as the policy will not be effective unless modifications are made as set out above.

Policy D4: Character and design of new development

The aspiration for high quality design as set out in the criteria at Policy D4 is generally supported. In particular criteria e) which seeks to ensure appropriate density to make the most efficient use of the land whilst responding to local character and context.

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

A change to Policy A9 is requested to read:

“Policy A9 77 to 83 and 99 to 103 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford
The site is allocated for at least 3,870 sq.m of offices / research and development (B1a and b).
... - Contemporary A design approach, whilst respecting respects the proximity to the River Wey
... “

This is to reflect the existing development on site and the need to maximise efficient use of this very sustainable site and which respects the site’s context without being prescriptive in terms of the design approach.

**Attached documents:**

Reps__Guildford_Submission_Local_Plan_FocussedConsulta__Walnut_Tree_Close__July_2017-1_Redacted.pdf (746 KB)
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Water Response</th>
<th>Waste Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47667</td>
<td>A9 - 77-83 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford, GU1 4UH</td>
<td>On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.</td>
<td>On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Attached documents:

Total records: 8.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A10 - Land for Sustainable Movement Corridor Town Centre Phase 2, off Walnut Tree Close, Guildford
**Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/8109</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 8556385 / Guildford Residents Association, EGRA (Amanda Mullarkey)</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A10</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A10: Sustainable Movement Corridor, off Walnut Tree Close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See comments under Questions 1 to 3 and transport policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3905</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 8561377 / The Guildford Society (Julian Lyon)</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A10</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land for Sustainable Movement Corridor Town Centre Phase 2, Off Walnut Tree Close, Guildford – We have no comment with regard to the amendment of this Policy, but we have some lack of clarity as to where the remaining parts of the proposed corridor are provided for in the land allocations. Surely the entire corridor should be allocated (to the extent possible).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1173</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 15239169 / First Regional Estates Ltd (Daniel Goldberg)</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong> GL Hearn Limited (Paul Woods)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A10</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Our client, First Regional Estates Ltd, is the owner of the Jewsons builders’ merchant site, Walnut Tree Close in Guildford town centre. A strip of land within the western and northern boundaries of our client’s site forms part of the site allocation for a ‘Sustainable Movement Corridor: Town Centre Phase 2’ under Policy A10. As set out in the Council’s Progress Update on Sustainable Movement Corridor Scheme (June 2016), we understand that the branch of the corridor along the western side of our client’s site is to be used by pedestrians and cyclists to access Guildford railway station and onwards to the town centre, as an alternative to the sustainable movement route on the southern section of Walnut Trees Close.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We object to this site allocation on the basis that the timing for this initiative is uncertain and the allocation would potentially prevent the full and effective use of our client’s site for alternative development. The sustainable movement corridor scheme is included within the Council’s Infrastructure Schedule at Appendix C of the Submission Draft Local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plan. This notes that the scheme is to be delivered by a combination of Surrey County Council, Guildford Borough Council, Network Rail and developers(s) and that the delivery timeframe is set between 2018 and 2033. It is further noted that the scheme is likely to cost in the region of £5 -10m and the likely funding source will be developer contributions and the Local Growth Fund. We further understand that the works are subject to the replacement of Yorkie’s bridge across the railway, which in itself is estimated to be delivered in the same timeframe by the same partners and through the same funding source. The Guildford Borough Transport Strategy (2016) confirms that both these schemes do not fall within the ‘Committed’ category as defined within the Strategy; rather they fall within the ‘Anticipated’ category and are subject to a positive business case being prepared.

In the absence of certainty at this stage on the deliverability of these schemes, we consider that the area of our client’s site the subject of Policy A10 should be incorporated into the Policy A5 allocation within the Submission Draft Local Plan and the A10 allocation deleted accordingly. As part of the redevelopment of our client’s site under Policy A5, there should be an opportunity to provide for a shared pedestrian/cycle link through the site linking Station View with Walnut Tree Close and the alignment of this could be appropriately designed as part of a comprehensive redevelopment of the entire site.

Having regard to the above, we consider that Policy A10 is unsound on the basis that it is not justified and does not represent the most appropriate strategy for the development of the area when considered against the alternative of a comprehensive redevelopment which has the potential to incorporate a pedestrian/cycle link.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2682</th>
<th>Respondent: 15239169 / First Regional Estates Ltd (Daniel Goldberg)</th>
<th>Agent: GL Hearn Limited (Paul Woods)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We submitted comments to the proposed submission draft version of the Local Plan on 18 July 2016 in respect of Policy A10 (Comment ID PSLPS16/1151) on behalf of our client First Regional Estates Limited, which is the owner of the Jewsons builders merchants site. We objected to the policy and recommended that it be deleted. Whilst part of the site allocation has been incorporated into the allocation under Policy A5, for the reasons set out in our original representations, we maintain our objection that the policy should be deleted. Notwithstanding, we note that further changes have been made to the policy wording to which our client strongly objects.

Under Requirements paragraph (1), reference to Appendix C Infrastructure Schedule has been deleted and in its place reference has now been made to ‘...having regard to the Sustainable Movement Corridor Supplementary Planning Document’ (SPD). We understand from the Council's Planning Policy team that this SPD has yet to be produced even in draft and will not be produced until after work on the preparation of the Local Plan is complete. We consider that the draft Plan is unsound in making reference to, and placing justification on, a SPD that does not currently exist.

Under paragraph (2), the wording has been amended to indicate that access to the Jewsons site will only be maintained for pedestrians. Our client strongly objects to this change on the basis that restricting vehicular access will severely prejudice both the existing operation and future development potential of the site.

With respect to the existing operation, there is no indication that the policy will be implemented in tandem with the redevelopment of the Jewsons site under Policy A5. The Policy as currently worded is ill conceived and should be deleted. The operation of the Jewsons Builders Merchant site is reliant on its main vehicular access from Walnut Tree Close which is used by all customers and visitors and through which trade is undertaken. Taking away these access rights will prejudice this local employer. Secondary access is provided to the site from Station View, however Station View is not adopted highway and access is through the station car park and mixed use development to the south and is not suitable as the main access to the site.
Restricting vehicular access from Walnut Tree Close as part of any redevelopment of the Jewsons site would also serve to restrict the options and flexibility for redevelopment of the site and so undermine its redevelopment potential. In our view, it is difficult to see how vehicular access to serve a single development site in this location (which would have the benefit of additional access from Station View) would give rise to traffic generation levels which would undermine the Council's aspirations for a sustainable movement corridor in this location.

For the above reasons we consider that the policy is unsound.

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

For the reasons set out in our original representations, we consider that the policy should be deleted. Notwithstanding, access to the Jewsons site from Walnut Tree Close should be maintained for vehicles and pedestrians and reference to the Sustainable Movement Corridor SPD should be deleted.

 Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7126</th>
<th>Respondent: 15629025 / Surrey County Council (Sir or madam)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A10</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td><strong>Policy A10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land for sustainable movement corridor Town Centre Phase 2, off Walnut Tree Close Page 147</strong></td>
<td>In the 2003 Local Plan under Policy M7 (Access from Walnut Tree Close to Guildford Station) a scheme involved the Safeguarding of part of Walnut Tree Close. This no longer needs safeguarding for the reasons envisaged. However, some of the safeguarded land comprising the West/East alignment of the corridor may be needed for future operational purposes, for whatever schemes goes forward in this area.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/5408</th>
<th>Respondent: 17285857 / Network Rail (Daniel Chalk)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A10</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td><strong>Policy A10: Land for Sustainable Movement Corridor Town Centre Phase 2, off Walnut Tree Close, Guildford</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Network Rail are currently working closely with Guildford Borough Council to specify and remit a study that will look at all railway land requirements around Guildford to ensure that sufficient land is available to provide the infrastructure to meet growth and demand on the railway (potentially in the form of additional platform capacity).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This study will help to ascertain the land available for development and is an important example of how Network Rail is working closely with our stakeholders to identify land that can be utilised to meet the needs of the railway and the wider community.

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

**Attached documents:**

Total records: 6.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A11 - Guildford Park Car Park, Guildford Park Road, Guildford
## Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/8110</th>
<th>Respondent: 8556385 / Guildford Residents Association, EGRA (Amanda Mullarkey)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A11: Guildford Park Car Park

Welcome. Important to avoid overdevelopment and limit the height of development

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1194</th>
<th>Respondent: 8729313 / Lisa Wright</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OBJECT, Not enough homes.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/982</th>
<th>Respondent: 8848033 / Paul Gerrard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to housing on this site. This is a previously developed site, so makes sense to redevelop it. However, it was not previously used for housing and is within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, and therefore any redevelopment, especially for housing, is subject to EU/UK legislation (NPPF 119). The impact of development cannot be mitigated with SANGs because at present there is no evidence base to support SANGs as required by NRM6 viii, NPPF 158 and 166.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7127</th>
<th>Respondent: 15629025 / Surrey County Council (Sir or madam)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We have concerns regarding Water Supply Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the water network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing water infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed water supply strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.

We have concerns regarding Wastewater Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.

There is a history of some sewer flooding. Developer funded impact study required to understand implications of development.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Water Response</th>
<th>Waste Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42296</td>
<td>A11 - Guildford Park Car Park, Guildford Park Road, Guildford</td>
<td>The water network capacity in this area may be unable to support the demand anticipated from this development. Local upgrades to the existing water network infrastructure may be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. The developer is encouraged to work Thames Water early on in the planning process to understand what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered.</td>
<td>The wastewater network capacity in this area may be unable to support the demand anticipated from this development. Local upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are may be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a potential wastewater network capacity constraint, the developer should liaise with Thames Water to determine whether a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered is required. The detailed drainage strategy should be submitted with the planning application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Attached documents:

Total records: 6.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A12 - Bright Hill Car Park, Sydenham Road, Guildford
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5709  Respondent: 8559297 / Holy Trinity Amenity Group (Robert Bromham)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A12

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

A12 Bright Hill Car Park. P151 - 152

We note the statement “Opportunities - Improvements to landscaping and biodiversity given the full extent of hardstanding on this site”. It will be impossible to do this, or provide the special high quality development that this site, which is in the Town Centre Conservation Area, requires, with a development of 60 homes. The current plan proposed 33. We ask that the target be reduced to 45 or less homes.

The Robin Hood pub is excluded from the development although it is prominent within the site. We ask that the pub be acquired to allow it to become part of, and to enhance, the development as a reminder of the previous Victorian development on the site, and a suitable use found for this locally listed building. We also ask that a feasibility study is made of the design options for underground parking, to maximise the potential of the site.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4309  Respondent: 8559297 / Holy Trinity Amenity Group (Robert Bromham)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A12

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

P170. Bright Hill Car Park.

We welcome the reduction in number of dwellings from 60 to 40. However this is still too many if some car parking is to be retained, green space provided, and a quality development provided that is fit for this conspicuous site in the Town Centre Conservation Area. We ask that the number of dwellings be further reduced to 30, which is the target given by the current Borough Plan.

We note that only housing is given as an allocated use in the Site Listings, P142, car parking is not given.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8272  Respondent: 8566497 / Derek Horne & Associates Ltd (Derek Horne)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A12

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

POLICY A12, SITE 174
The Council is underestimating the importance of short stay car parking which is essential if Guildford Town Centre is to prosper, befitting its status as the Country Town in Surrey and resist the competition posed by online shopping. Retailing is the principal function of Guildford and it needs to be protected. Bright Hill car park is ideally located to serve the shops in Upper High Street which will otherwise suffer.

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

Attached documents:

POLICY A12: Bright Hill Car Park, Sydenham Rd, Guildford

While the retention of the view of the cathedral is to be retained, I object to the loss of the important view from Bright Hill of the historic Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) over the Hogs Back. The number of houses to be built on this site has been reduced from 60 to 40. This reduction should allow the two important views from Bright Hill of (1) Guildford Cathedral and (2) the historic Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) over the Hogs Back to be preserved. Bright Hill is used by many residents as a walking route to the Town Centre and these views are an established part of the walk. The uplifting experience of the walk encourages residents to master the steep hill and walk rather than drive into town.

There is a lack of open space within the town and the magnificent country view in this town walk is a way of bringing the countryside into the town.

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

Attached documents:

I object to the reduction of homes proposed on this brownfield site.

Put the car park under ground and you have room for more than 60 homes.

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

Attached documents:

I object to the reduction of homes proposed on this brownfield site.

Put the car park under ground and you have room for more than 60 homes.

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

Attached documents:
I object to housing on this site. This is a previously developed site, so makes sense to redevelop it. However, it was not previously used for housing and is within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, and therefore any redevelopment, especially for housing, is subject to EU/UK legislation (NPPF 119). The impact of development cannot be mitigated with SANGs because at present there is no evidence base to support SANGs as required by NRM6 viii, NPPF 158 and 166.

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

Attached documents:

---

**A12 Bright Hill Car Park**

I note the “Opportunities - Improvements to landscaping and biodiversity given the full extent of hardstanding on this site”. It will be impossible to do this or to provide the special high quality development that this site, which is in the Town Centre Conservation Area, requires, with a development of 60 homes. The current plan proposed 33. I ask that the target be reduced to 45 or less homes.

The Robin Hood pub is excluded from the development although it is prominent within the site. I ask that the pub be acquired to allow it to become part of and to enhance the development as a reminder of the previous Victorian development on the site, and that a suitable use be found for this locally listed building.

**Town Centre Riverside Sites, Open Space**

I welcome the designation of protected open space for the immediate riverside on site A2 (Cinema) and ask that this be continued along Bedford Wharf, and applied wherever possible in the town centre, including the Portsmouth Road Car Park.

The designation of much of this area is as “Strategic Employment Site (Office and Research and Development), but this town centre area is not suitable for R and D which often requires spacious layout and a low density of employees.

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

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7803  Respondent: 15674273 / Savills for Thames Water (Katherine Jones)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A12

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

We have concerns regarding Water Supply Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the water network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing water infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed water supply strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not
to underestimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.

On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Water Response</th>
<th>Waste Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>679</td>
<td>A12 - Bright Hill Car Park, Sydenham Road, Guildford</td>
<td>On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.</td>
<td>On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Attached documents:

Total records: 11.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A13 - Kernal Court, Walnut Tree Close, Guildford
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Comment ID: pslp172/3908  Respondent: 8561377 / The Guildford Society (Julian Lyon)  Agent:


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

Kernal Court, Walnut Tree Close, Guildford – We are keen to see development of a number of sites on Walnut Tree Close as a consolidated master-planned exercise including flood management systems. It is not clear why a development on this site should be obliged to facilitate the Sustainable Movement Corridor when many of the prospective residents may make relatively little use of the new corridor that they could not already have done via Yorkie’s Bridge and Walnut Tree Close.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/985  Respondent: 8848033 / Paul Gerrard  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A13

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

I object to housing on this site. This is a previously developed site, so makes sense to redevelop it. However, it was not previously used for housing and is within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, and therefore any redevelopment, especially for housing, is subject to EU/UK legislation (NPPF 119). The impact of development cannot be mitigated with SANGs because at present there is no evidence base to support SANGs as required by NRM6 viii, NPPF 158 and 166.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7864  Respondent: 11731841 / Barton Willmore LLP (Emma-Lisa Shiells)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A13

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

GUILDFORD BOROUGH PROPOSED SUBMISSION LOCAL PLAN: STRATEGY AND SITES CONSULTATION REPRESENTATION BY THE CO-OPERATIVE GROUP JULY 2016

Introduction

1. We act on behalf of The Co-operative Group (TCG) and have been instructed to submit the following representation to the Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (June 2016)
2. As you will be aware TCG is the landowner of a site known as ‘Kernal Court, Walnut Tree Close’ (the Site). This Site is designated in the emerging Site Allocations as ‘Policy A13: Kernal Court, Walnut Tree Close, Guildford’. The extent of the Site is identified on the accompanying Site Plan.

3. This representation follows the representations submitted by TCG in both November 2013 and September 2014 to the Strategy and Site Issues and Options consultation and the Draft Local Plan consultation respectively.

Examination and Next Steps

We trust the above will assist in the formulation of the Local Plan and request that these recommendations are reflected within the submitted Local Plan. It is important to note that, as we are proposing changes to the Local Plan, we would like to express an interest in participating in the Local Plan Examination. In the meantime, we would be happy to discuss these representations in more detail with GBC Officers.

Please confirm receipt of this representation and keep us informed of the submission of the Local Plan for Examination. If you have any queries or require any further information please do not hesitate to contact Emma-Lisa Shiells or Mark Harris at this office.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7865</th>
<th>Respondent: 11731841 / Barton Willmore LLP (Emma-Lisa Shiells)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 2: Sites - Policy A13

As stated above, TCG is the owner of the Site allocated under Policy A13 for approximately 100 homes (Use Class C3) which has been the subject of pre-application discussions with your Officers for the redevelopment of the Site to provide residential and / student accommodation.

On behalf of TCG, we support the principle of the Policy which confirms the acceptability of the removal of the industrial use at the Site and the replacement with residential. However, we object to the land use intent of the Policy as we consider that the allocation should not be solely for residential use. The Site should instead be allocated for residential (Use Class C3) and / student accommodation (Sui Generis).

Student accommodation is considered to be an entirely appropriate use given the Site’s proximity to the Railway Station, the Town Centre and in particular it’s easy walking distance to the University Campus. The Site’s constraints (in terms of access, irregular shape not lending itself well for employment use), the Site’s surrounding uses (including student accommodation adjacent to the Site), the nature of the forthcoming uses and the transition occurring in the area also underline its suitability for both residential and student accommodation. This is recognised within supporting text of Policy A13 which highlights the changing character in the area from primarily industrial to residential (including student accommodation).

TCG has considered their options for the Site and concluded that residential and / student accommodation also represents a deliverable and viable development opportunity and as such, seeks that Policy A13 is amended to include the allocation for residential (Use Class C3) and / student accommodation (Sui Generis).

It is important to reference Paragraph 4.2.7 of the emerging Local Plan which confirms that any additional student accommodation built over and above projected need will count towards the general housing requirement. As such the provision of student accommodation (regardless of whether it is meeting an identified need or not) will relieve pressure on the housing market in a location that is entirely appropriate for such a land-use.
Accordingly the emerging Local Plan should be updated to reflect these comments within Policy E3 and Policy A13.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7773  Respondent: 11832961 / The National Trust - London and SE (Rachel Botcherby)  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A13
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We are pleased to see that a requirement of this policy is that the ‘design responds positively to the changing character of this area, whilst being sensitive to the corridor of the River Wey’. However, again the bullet points listed in opportunities should all be reflected as requirements of the redevelopment of the site.

In addition, the criteria listed above for Policy A9 would also be applicable to the redevelopment of other sites along the river frontage of Walnut Tree Close and therefore a more detailed set of design principles should be included with this and other site specific policies.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7804  Respondent: 15674273 / Savills for Thames Water (Katherine Jones)  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A13
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We have concerns regarding Water Supply Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the water network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing water infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed water supply strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.

On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7962  Respondent: 15689953 / Environment Agency (Oliver Rathmill)  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A13
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3.1.2 Policy A13: Kernal Court, Walnut Close, Guildford
Although this site lies within flood zone 1 we noted that safe access may be questionable. It does not appear that this has been taken into account and no evidence that demonstrates that safe access is achievable has been provided.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/5200  Respondent: 17417729 / The Co-operative Group and Scape Living (TCG SL)  Agent: Barton Willmore (Ben Shaw)


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

[text of attachment reproduced below]

Introduction

1. We act on behalf of The Co-operative Group (‘TCG’) and Scape Living (‘SL’), and have been instructed to submit a further representation to the Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (June 2017).

2. As you will be aware TCG is the landowner of a site known as ‘Kernal Court, Walnut Tree Close’ (‘the Site’). This Site is designated in the emerging Site Allocations as ‘Policy A13: Kernal Court, Walnut Tree Close, Guildford’. The extent of the Site is identified on the accompanying Site Plan provided at Appendix 1.

3. SL, an established student housing provider and operator of the adjacent highly successful student accommodation site “Scape 1”, has agreed terms with TCG in relation to a potential redevelopment of the Site for purpose built student accommodation. This is the subject of early pre-application discussions with Borough Council Officers in advance of the submission of a Planning Application by late 2017. The scheme will meet a demonstrable need for additional purpose built / managed accommodation in this location based on SL’s own experience including a significant waiting list.

4. The proposed development is supported by the University of Surrey (‘UoS’) (see the letter at Appendix 2) and other Higher Education Institutions in the Guildford area as a means of providing modern, well managed and accessible accommodation for those students living off - campus. This is to meet an increasing need for such a form of accommodation which is increasingly preferred by students to traditional shared living in rented accommodation in the private sector.

5. The submission of this representation follows the representations submitted by TCG in November 2013, September 2014 and July 2016 to the Strategy and Site Issues and Options consultation and the Draft Local Plan consultation respectively.

29. As stated above, TCG is the owner of the Site allocated under draft Policy A13 for approximately 100 homes (Use Class C3) which has been the subject of pre-application discussions with your Officers for the redevelopment of the Site to provide residential and / student accommodation.

30. SL, a student housing provider, partners with institutions and developers to provide highquality and affordable purpose built student accommodation and have expressed interest in redeveloping the Site. The UoS have written a letter (Appendix 2) supporting SL’s proposals to provide more purpose built student accommodation within Guildford, for the benefit of their students, whilst easing the existing and future housing pressures in the Town.
31. On behalf of TCG and SL, we support the principle of the Policy which confirms the acceptability of the removal of the industrial use at the Site and the replacement with residential. However, we object to the land use intent of the Policy as we consider that the allocation should not be solely for residential use. The Site should instead be allocated for residential (Use Class C3) and / student accommodation (Sui Generis).

32. Student accommodation is considered to be an entirely appropriate use given the Site’s proximity to the Railway Station, the Town Centre and in particular it’s easy walking distance to the University Campus. The Site’s constraints (in terms of access, irregular shape not lending itself well for employment use), the Site’s surrounding uses (including student accommodation adjacent to the Site), the nature of the forthcoming uses and the transition occurring in the area also underline its suitability for both residential and student accommodation. This is recognised within supporting text of Policy A13 which highlights the changing character in the area from primarily industrial to residential (including student accommodation).

33. We note that the site was originally identified for student accommodation in the initial draft versions of the Plan. This position appears to have changed following an assessment of the site’s suitability in Land Availability Assessment (LAA) February 2016. This concluded that the site is most suited for residential development to provide new homes to help meet the identified need. It also stated that C3 housing can flexibility meet the needs of the local population, including students who wish to live in the local community. Despite this encouragement of students in this location (albeit living in C3 units), the assessment also concluded that it would also be prudent to avoid an overconcentration of specific purpose built accommodation in this locality.

34. We consider the assessment of the site in the LAA to be flawed for the following reasons:

(i) There is no accepted definition of ‘overconcentration’ in the Plan or Guidance. It is also highly unreasonable to conclude that overconcentration would occur when there is only one existing student accommodation in the immediate locality and the possibility of only one further building.

(ii) Despite wishing to avoid an overconcentration, the LAA actually encourages student accommodation in the proposed C3 allocation. This would undermine both the housing need requirement by removing accommodation from the private sector and encourage students to live in unmanaged accommodation where the negative effects of student living are far more likely to arise with an impact on wider residential amenity. This would simply not occur in a privately managed accommodation building such as Scape I.

(iii) The site has the potential to make a far greater contribution towards housing need than is identified in the LAA. A conventional residential scheme is only likely to have a capacity of 100 units. Applying affordable housing policy and mix requirements, we estimate that such a scheme could accommodate 162 students. The emerging SL scheme identifies the site as having a capacity for circa 350 rooms plus circa 14 C3 flats. This represents a significant net increase in both the student capacity but also the amount of private sector accommodation that will be made available to other housing needs as a consequence of the development. A student housing scheme in the right location (such as this) can therefore make a far greater contribution to housing needs in the Guildford area.

35. TCG and SL has considered their options for the Site and concluded that student accommodation represents a deliverable and viable development opportunity and as such, seeks that Policy A13 is amended to include the allocation for residential (Use Class C3) and / student accommodation (Sui Generis).

36. It is important to reference Paragraph 4.2.7 of the emerging Local Plan which confirms that any additional student accommodation built over and above projected need will count towards the general housing requirement. As such the provision of student accommodation (regardless of whether it is meeting an identified need or not) will relieve pressure on the housing market in a location that is entirely appropriate for such a land-use.

37. Accordingly, the emerging Local Plan should be updated to reflect these comments within Policy E3 and Policy A13.

**Affordable Housing**

38. We note at paragraph 4.2.35 the Plan identifies the types of residential accommodation within Use Class C3 where affordable housing will be sought. In accordance with PPG paragraph 21 (as referred to in paragraph 9 above), we
recommend the Plan specifically states that student accommodation is not required to provide affordable housing due to its ability to increase the availability of low cost housing.

**Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area**

39. We note that the supporting text to Policy P5 (see paragraph 4.3.51) has been amended to include the requirement for student accommodation to contribute towards the provision of SANG. This is on the basis that it is considered to be a form of permanent accommodation.

40. This is a change from the adopted Local Plan and also the determination of the Planning Application for Scape 1 in 2014 where student accommodation was considered to be exempt as it is not a form of permanent accommodation and falls outside the C Use Class. There has been no material change in national guidance to have justified this change in approach and it remains the case that student accommodation is not permanent as it is temporary, term based living. In addition, students generally do not use the Thames Basin Heaths for leisure purposes and are not dog-owners in the local area to the extent they would have an impact that necessitates a contribution.

41. On this basis, we recommend student accommodation is removed from paragraph 4.3.51.

**Examination and Next Steps**

42. We trust the above will assist in the formulation of the Local Plan and request that these recommendations are reflected within the submitted Local Plan. It is important to note that, as we are proposing changes to the Local Plan, we would like to participate in the Local Plan Examination in order to contribute towards the proceedings to best inform the examination and present amendments / additional evidence so the Plan can achieve soundness. In the meantime, we would be happy to discuss these representations in more detail with GBC Officers.

[Appendix's in attachment]

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

**Attached documents:** 24099_A3_LP_Rep_240717_FINAL.pdf (3.0 MB)

---

**Site ID** | **Site Name** | **Water Response** | **Waste Response**
--- | --- | --- | ---
51752 A13 - Kernal Court, Walnut Tree Close, Guildford | The water treatment capacity in this area may be unable to support the demand anticipated from this development. Minor infrastructure upgrades may be required to ensure sufficient treatment capacity is available to serve this development. Thames Water would welcome the opportunity to work closely with the Local Planning Authority and the developer to better understand and effectively plan for the water treatment infrastructure needs required to serve this development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: Water Treatment Works upgrades can take 18 months to 3 years to design and build | On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater
infrastructure capability in relation to this site.

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

Attached documents:

Total records: 9.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A14 - Wey Corner, Walnut Tree Close, Guildford
## Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/3911</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong></th>
<th>8561377 / The Guildford Society (Julian Lyon)</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wey Corner, Walnut Tree Close, Guildford – This site is already under development subject to a planning permission for residential use for 56 units (hence the amendment to the plan (at a density of 147 dpH). In principle, we consider the Walnut Tree Close sites should be considered together to allow for improvements to roads, paths, towpaths, river frontages and flood risk protection.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/1195</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong></th>
<th>8729313 / Lisa Wright</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OBJECT. This is a large prominent site with good links to station and town so a higher density of housing is required to maximise its potential.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/2235</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong></th>
<th>8729313 / Lisa Wright</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the low density of this site and question whether a higher amount of homes can be provided on this Brownfield site.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/986</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong></th>
<th>8848033 / Paul Gerrard</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to housing on this site. This is a previously developed site, so makes sense to redevelop it. However, it was not previously used for housing and is within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, and therefore any redevelopment, especially for housing, is subject to EU/UK legislation (NPPF 119). The impact of development cannot be mitigated with SANGs because at present there is no evidence base to support SANGs as required by NRM6 viii, NPPF 158 and 166.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7774  Respondent: 11832961 / The National Trust - London and SE (Rachel Botcherby)  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A14
Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The same comments apply for this site as for A13. Specifically in both cases, as well as site A9, we note that no mention is made for the desire for these sites to include large areas of green space fronting the Navigations as part of a wider linear park that was original set out in the Town Centre Masterplan document. The concept of a new riverside community park was, and is, supported by the National Trust, particularly the benefits this could bring to enhancing the immediate setting of the Navigations and the opportunity it would provide for more people to access, appreciate and understand the historic significance of the Navigations. It is disappointing to see that such concepts and opportunities developed through the Town Centre Masterplan process are being lost through this iteration of the local plan.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7805  Respondent: 15674273 / Savills for Thames Water (Katherine Jones)  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A14
Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.

On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7963  Respondent: 15689953 / Environment Agency (Oliver Rathmill)  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A14
Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
3.1.3 Policy A14: Wey Corner, Walnut Close, Guildford
This site lies partly within flood zone 2 and 3 we note that safe access may be questionable. It does not appear that this has been taken into account and no evidence that demonstrates that safe access is achievable has been provided.

3.2 Overcoming this point of unsoundness
In its current form the Plan is not consistent with national planning policy as it fails to justify the allocation of these sites. At present evidence is not in place to demonstrate safe access and egress. To justify the allocation of these sites in the Plan an assessment should be made of the safe access and egress routes from these sites to identify the hazards associated them. We consider that these assessments should be made prior to the allocation of these sites for future ‘more vulnerable’ residential development.

Where hazards are greater than a very low hazard consideration should be given to whether flood plans specific to the development would be acceptable. There should be sufficient information to enable Emergency Planners to determine if evacuation is possible. Issues to cover may include the rate of onset of flooding, the availability of flood warnings, duration of flooding, depth of flooding and the length of the evacuation route.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3367  Respondent: 17406209 / Guildford Vision Group (Andrew Black)  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A14  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY A14 - Wey Corner, Walnut Tree Close, Guildford

4.31 This site needs to be considered as a single strategic parcel alongside other sites in WalnutTree Close such as A10 and A13. This ribbon of land sandwiched between rail and river incapable of providing a much better contribution to Guildford.

4.32 GVG support the principle of the scheme being allocated for development but would like to see a co-ordinated masterplan approach to sites in Walnut Tree Close.

4.33 In relation to policy A9, A10 A13 and A14, GVG considers that the entire area of Walnut TreeClose should be allocated for medium density, mixed use development, rather than taking the piecemeal approach that is analogous to the approach of GBC to the rest of the town centre.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4803  Respondent: 17484449 / Thames Water Utilities Ltd (Sir or Madam)  Agent: Savills (Richard Hill)  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A14  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Water Response</th>
<th>Waste Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42317</td>
<td>A14 - Wey Corner, Walnut Tree Close, Guildford</td>
<td>On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site.</td>
<td>On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Attached documents:

Total records: 9.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A15 - Land at Guildford Cathedral, Alresford Road, Guildford
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7707</th>
<th>Respondent: 8560577 / Caroline Lloyd</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A15</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please bear the following in mind when considering applications to develop the land around the Cathedral:

1. This side of Guildford has recently become much more developed, eg the Research Park, Manor Park, the Sports Park and needs to retain some open green space. Wasn't it given to Guildford to be an open green space to be enjoyed by all?
2. Traffic congestion down The Chase and Madrid Road can be very heavy and not just in the rush hour.
3. The back entrance to the station is wholly inadequate and adds to this congestion, due to two bus stops and cars and taxis picking up and dropping off rail passengers.
4. The entrance to any development would be best taken off the road which leads up to the Cathedral rather than off Ridgemount, which in part has a pavement only on one side. This already feels hazardous as pedestrians frequently walk in the road which is difficult for vehicles. There is also a bus station at the bottom of the road and there are often buses reversing into the five way junction and also parked in the road. (do they have permission to park in the road?).
5. There is instability in the hill. As residents of Ridgemount we, and several of our neighbours, have had to have our homes underpinned.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/987</th>
<th>Respondent: 8848033 / Paul Gerrard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A15</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to additional housing on this site. This is a previously developed site, so makes sense to redevelop it. However, it is within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, and therefore any redevelopment, especially for housing, is subject to EU/UK legislation (NPPF 119). The impact of development cannot be mitigated with SANGs because at present there is no evidence base to support SANGs as required by NRM6 viii, NPPF 158 and 166.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/386</th>
<th>Respondent: 10798049 / Steve &amp; Maureen Knight</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A15</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support – a viable site
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1179  Respondent: 10849921 / I Lazopoulos  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A15

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

The land at Guildford Cathedral is currently designated as Protected Open Space. I object to the proposed change in status of this site to C3 housing on the grounds that it would have a significantly negative impact both on the wildlife and local community, and also importantly would ruin the vista of Guildford Cathedral, a historic landmark for Guildford and tourist attraction.

The proposed development of 100 dwellings at Guildford Cathedral would negatively affect the local community in terms of:

• Significant traffic congestion on Guildford Park Road leading into the town centre and out towards the A3 will only worsen due to the developments proposed in and around Walnut Tree Close, Guildford Station, along Farnham Road and Cathedral land. Given the recent road traffic accidents around the Friary Centre which resulted in a fatality and serious injuries, proposed development of the Cathedral land would result in congestion on Alresford Road, Benbrick Road and Ridgemount which are not equipped to deal with the throughput of vehicles from a further 100 dwellings, making it quite unsafe for pedestrians and the local community comprising of children. Moreover, the inadequate pavements in the area and bus depot at the bottom of Ridgemount makes it difficult and potentially unsafe for cars and pedestrians as buses manoeuvre in and out of the premises.
• Inadequate local infrastructure including schools
• Damage to local housing in Alresford Road, Benbrick Road, Ridgemount and Scholars Walk due to problems related to subsidence and inadequate draining.
• Damage to natural wildlife

Given the large number of proposed new dwellings for Guildford town centre, Onslow and surrounding areas, it is even more crucial that the Protected Open Space at Guildford Cathedral remains protected to ensure the health and wellbeing of the local community, natural wildlife and reputation of Guildford city and its historic landmark.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1178  Respondent: 10857825 / S Ting  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A15

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

The land at Guildford Cathedral is currently designated as Protected Open Space. I object to the proposed change in status of this site to C3 housing on the grounds that it would have a significantly negative impact both on the wildlife and local community, and also importantly would ruin the vista of Guildford Cathedral, a historic landmark for Guildford and tourist attraction.
The proposed development of 100 dwellings at Guildford Cathedral would negatively affect the local community in terms of:

- Significant traffic congestion on Guildford Park Road leading into the town centre and out towards the A3 will only worsen due to the developments proposed in and around Walnut Tree Close, Guildford Station, along Farnham Road and Cathedral land. Given the recent road traffic accidents around the Friary Centre which resulted in a fatality and serious injuries, proposed development of the Cathedral land would result in congestion on Alresford Road, Benbrick Road and Ridgemount which are not equipped to deal with the throughput of vehicles from a further 100 dwellings, making it quite unsafe for pedestrians and the local community comprising of children. Moreover, the inadequate pavements in the area and bus depot at the bottom of Ridgemount makes it difficult and potentially unsafe for cars and pedestrians as buses manoeuvre in and out of the premises.
- Inadequate local infrastructure including schools
- Damage to local housing in Alresford Road, Benbrick Road, Ridgemount and Scholars Walk due to problems related to subsidence and inadequate draining.
- Damage to natural wildlife

Given the large number of proposed new dwellings for Guildford town centre, Onslow and surrounding areas, it is even more crucial that the Protected Open Space at Guildford Cathedral remains protected to ensure the health and wellbeing of the local community, natural wildlife and reputation of Guildford city and its historic landmark.

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

Attached documents:
In view of the vote to leave the European Union the housing need for Guildford is likely to change in the near future and alteration of the current status of the site in question may well turn out to be a hasty decision to be later repented at leisure.

In summary I object to the change in status of this site to C3 housing on the grounds that it is inappropriate for development due its nature and any development would have a negative impact on the surrounding community both in terms of impact on the setting of the cathedral and the local infrastructure. I sincerely hope that you will take these points into consideration during your deliberations on the status of the Cathedral hill site.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3503  Respondent: 10876705 / Olive Edwards  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A15

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

I am writing as a result of the changes that you are proposing to make to the Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (2017) regarding the Guildford Town Centre Site Allocation A15 Land at Guildford Cathedral, Alresford Road, Guildford listed on page 142 and detailed on pages 176 and 177.

The proposed new wording in point 6 is open to too many interpretations and can be used to justify particular decisions rather than giving specific direction. The use of the word "unacceptable" lends itself to subjective rather than objective conclusions. The ancient tithe hedge running along Ridgemount and Alresford Road should be protected at all costs as should all the trees with tree preservation orders on them, as well as other significant trees and hedgerows. The proposed new wording puts these at some consideration risk.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6464  Respondent: 10933473 / Esther and Adrian Parry  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A15

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


Please see below our thoughts on the most recent Local Plan.

We notice on page 157 you label the above land under “Existing use”: open space and residential properties, we are sure this land should be labelled “Protected Open Space”. It is our understanding that the Cathedral were only allowed to build 6 + 1 houses for their staff quarters and this was limited due to the “protected open space” status of the land and public footpaths running over the land.

We notice in your document pg. 157 the re-classification as C3 Housing, 100 homes. Note: Linden Homes have recently put in a planning application for more 134 dwellings. This is unsuitable for a grade II* Listed Building (the Cathedral)
and its grounds. These 134 out of character dwellings will be highly visible from most view points. The view of the Cathedral from the north is already severely affected by the University of Surrey buildings.

The ancient tithe hedge running parallel with Ridgemount and Alresford Road is not listed in either the requirements section or key consideration section (pg. 157) of your document.

The land has a history of drainage problems and ground movement so approximately 100 or more homes will require expensive deep piling and will impact on the flooding problems and destabilization that has been experienced in Ridgemount and other immediate areas in recent years.

Finally 100 homes will generate notable extra traffic in an already congested area. Ridgemount and Alresford Road are minor roads with a heavy footfall due to the University with a pavement only on one side. This area is currently a semi-rural environment and would not be able to cope with the traffic likely to be generated by this proposal and of course this traffic would feed into the already congested Madrid Road/Guildford Park Road & contribute to the heavy traffic at the back of the train station & Guildford Town centre.

The site should remain designated as protected open space with the small number of cathedral houses. It is inappropriate to designate this site as C3 Housing and I ask for this to be seriously considered.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1383  **Respondent:** 10933473 / Esther and Adrian Parry  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A15

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

**Re: Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (2017). Guildford Town Centre Site Allocation A15 Land at Guildford Cathedral, Alresford Road, Guildford. On pages 142, 176, and 177.**

We have concerns on the new wording of requirements point 4 on page 176 - 'A holistic approach to the landscaping of the site to include no unacceptable impact on existing trees and mature hedges of significance'.

The word “Unacceptable” is very vague. Please can you be more specific. The original wording 'Protect existing trees and mature hedges of significance' (a wording not in the earlier submission) is more precise and doesn't rely on an interpretation of the word unacceptable.

Please clarify the use of the words 'of significance' - does this include the need to protect trees with Tree Preservation Orders on this site and to protect the Tithe Hedge bounding the site which should be protected under the Hedgerow Regulations of 1997 as it has a continuous length exceeding 20 metres, has existed for 30 years or more and satisfies at least one of the criteria listed in Part II of Schedule 1 of the Hedgerow Regulations 1997? The new wording should not replace the existing which should be strengthened and clarified.

Fundamentally we believe the site should remain designated as protected open space with the small number of Cathedral houses. It is inappropriate to designate this site as C3 Housing.

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

**Re: Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (2017). Guildford Town Centre Site Allocation A15 Land at Guildford Cathedral, Alresford Road, Guildford. On pages 142, 176, and 177.**

We have concerns on the new wording of requirements point 4 on page 176 - 'A holistic approach to the landscaping of the site to include no unacceptable impact on existing trees and mature hedges of significance'.

The word “Unacceptable” is very vague. Please can you be more specific. The original wording 'Protect existing trees and mature hedges of significance' (a wording not in the earlier submission) is more precise and doesn't rely on an interpretation of the word unacceptable.
mature hedges of significance’ (a wording not in the earlier submission) is more precise and doesn't rely on an interpretation of the word unacceptable.
Please clarify the use of the words ‘of significance’ - does this include the need to protect trees with Tree Preservation Orders on this site and to protect the Tithe Hedge bounding the site which should be protected under the Hedgerow Regulations of 1997 as it has a continuous length exceeding 20 metres, has existed for 30 years or more and satisfies at least one of the criteria listed in Part II of Schedule 1 of the Hedgerow Regulations 1997? The new wording should not replace the existing which should be strengthened and clarified.

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4807  Respondent: 10986241 / Michael Dawson  Agent:

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

This is currently a site designated as Protected Open Space. Therefore it is not accurate to describe the existing land use in your description on page 156 of the proposed sites section as ‘open space and residential properties’ although it is the case that the Cathedral was originally allowed to build 6 houses for their staff in the south-east corner of this protected open space site in what is now called Cathedral Close with an additional house built later to make it 7 houses. This development and subsequent additions were opposed because of the protected open space status and because some of the original houses were built across a public footpath.

To suggest that this site should be redesignated as C3 Housing for approximately 100 homes is inappropriate for a number of reasons. Firstly this site is the setting for a Grade II Listed Building – the Cathedral - and the houses will not only potentially obscure this listed building but because of its elevation will be visible from many other parts of Guildford particularly in the south and east. This is already the case when viewing the Cathedral from the north.

Secondly the site is bounded by an ancient tithe hedge on its southern boundary with Ridgemount and Alresford Road which needs listing in the requirements section of your proposed sites section if this proposal was to be accepted.

Thirdly the site has a history of drainage problems and subsidence so approximately 100 homes will require expensive deep piling and will impact on the flooding problems that have been experienced in Ridgemount in recent years.

Finally approximately 100 homes will generate additional traffic in the area. Ridgemount and Alresford Road are minor roads with limited pedestrian provision on one side only in what is currently a semi-rural environment and would not be able to cope with the traffic likely to be generated by this proposal and of course this traffic would feed into the already congested Madrid Road and Guildford Park Road and subsequently Guildford Town centre.

In summary this site should remain designated as protected open space with the small number of cathedral houses already built. While the limit of approximately 100 homes is less than the designation of 175 houses in the 2014 Local Plan revision that your new draft replaces it is still inappropriate to designate this site as C3 Housing and I ask for this to be reconsidered and withdrawn.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1300  Respondent: 10986241 / Michael Dawson  Agent:

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

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A15
I am writing as requested in response to the changes that you are proposing to make to the Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (2017). In particular I wish to make the following comments on the Guildford Town Centre Site Allocation A15 Land at Guildford Cathedral, Alresford Road, Guildford listed on page 142 and detailed on pages 176 and 177.

I welcome the addition of the word 'Design' in the third point of Key Consideration 3 and the addition of point 6 'Mature hedge (running along Ridgemount and Alresford Road)' in Key Considerations on page 176 although I note that these additions are not identified as such.

However, I am unhappy with the new wording of Requirements point 4 on page 176 - 'A holistic approach to the landscaping of the site to include no unacceptable impact on existing trees and mature hedges of significance'. The original wording - 'Protect existing trees and mature hedges of significance' (a wording not in the earlier submission) is more precise and doesn't rely on an interpretation of the word unacceptable. I presume the use of the words 'of significance' includes the need to protect trees with Tree Preservation Orders on this site and to protect the Tithe Hedge bounding the site which should be protected under the Hedgerow Regulations of 1997 as it has a continuous length exceeding 20 metres, has existed for 30 years or more and satisfies at least one of the criteria listed in Part II of Schedule 1 of the Hedgerow Regulations 1997? The new wording should not replace the existing which should be strengthened and clarified.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1122</th>
<th>Respondent: 15272545 / William Sutton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The proposal to build housing around the Cathedral has a number of implications that will be detrimental to the existing and new residents of the town.

Firstly, the road access to the site is all through small local roads. This will create increased traffic at a number of small junctions and bring more cars into an already congested area of Guildford. I can see no reason why the site should not be accessed from the Cathedral's own access road. Access via the Cathedral would mean that residents' trips to and from the A3 would not need to travel down Ridgemount, Madrid Road or Arlesford Road. At a minimum, if the development does go ahead, then the construction traffic should be via the Cathedral.

Secondly, this area is prone to localised flooding after moderate rain storms. Water often flows down Ridgemount and into residents' gardens and driveways. Replacing water-absorbing grass and woodland with water-repellent tarmac will only exacerbate this problem.

Thirdly, the space around the Cathedral is one of the few areas of green space in central Guildford, it is used as a recreation area by families and allows views to and from the Cathedral. All of this will be lost if development goes ahead.

Finally, whilst this plan does not detail the type of housing for the site, those presented by Linden homes and the Cathedral are totally out of proportion to the area and will have a major impact on the privacy and

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

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

I am concerned to see the current use of the land described as being open space and residential properties; the land is currently designated as a Protected Open Space. The small number of residential properties constructed for Cathedral staff has not altered this, and should not be used as a precedent to permit the excessive development proposed for the site. There are a number of reasons why the site cannot support 100 properties:

1. The open space around the Cathedral is enjoyed by a variety of local residents, as well as being one of the few open spaces for children to play in around this area. To lose the designation of protected open space would be a great blow for the community surrounding the Cathedral.

2. The land was purchased and given to the cathedral to stop the incursion of residential development up to the Cathedral and preserve the land around the cathedral as green open space. To lose the designation of protected open space would allow precisely the evil that the benefactor sought to prevent.

3. There is no indication that local infrastructure will be improved to cope with the demands of so many new residents. Schools and doctors' surgeries in the area are already over subscribed, and trains are at (or over) capacity at peak times.

4. Traffic is already a very significant problem in this area of Guildford. On weekday mornings Madrid Road/Guildford Park Road gridlocks from Ridgemount heading into town, and is at a standstill in the other direction from the Oval towards the A3. To have the additional cars from 100 properties travelling down Ridgemount and Alresford Road would exacerbate this problem. Those roads are also used as shared surfaces with pedestrians due to their narrow nature.

5. Much focus has been on the listed nature of the Cathedral, and the impact of 100 properties on that building. To develop the site to the extent proposed would be detrimental to the Cathedral's standing, as it would impact the views both from and towards the Cathedral. In addition, the scope of the proposed development is out of keeping with the semi-rural nature of the neighbouring roads, and would have a very negative impact on the surrounding area.

6. The cathedral site contains numerous underground springs, and drainage on the site is already poor. Ridgemount and the neighbouring road suffer from flooding after even minor periods of rain. Paving over a large amount of the site, and adding the burden of additional residential properties, will make this problem worse.

7. The requirement for new housing in the area will decrease following the restrictions on immigration that the government is set to introduce, and the predicted migration of jobs to Europe. We have already seen demand for housing drop and most economists predict that this will continue.

Although the reduction in proposed housing from the earlier version of the local plan is welcome, I would ask that the redesignation of this site to be withdrawn. I would be grateful for a receipt to show that these comments will be considered.

Yours

Naomi and Richard Vary

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

Attached documents:
Policy A15 - Land at Guildford Cathedral

This site is currently designated as protected open space. We write to object to the proposed redesignation of this site as C3 Housing for the following reasons.

1. This site is an important open green space, which benefits local residents in an area of Guildford which has few open green spaces for public enjoyment. In recent years, central Guildford has seen considerable development and it is more important than ever to protect our existing green spaces - especially in light of proposals to develop the neighbouring Guildford Park car park and station areas.

1. This site is the setting for the Cathedral, a Grade II Listed Building, which is an important Guildford landmark and which enjoys an elevated position visible from many other parts of Guildford. Development of this site for residential use will potentially obscure this listed building and impair views of the Cathedral from elsewhere in Guildford.

1. This site is not suitable for development for residential uses. It has a history of drainage and subsidence problems and would require extensive deep piling to accommodate 100 new homes. This in turn would have repercussions for existing homes in neighbouring roads (Ridgemount, Alresford Road, Scholars Walk etc) and would impact on the flooding problems that have been experienced in this area in recent years.

1. A development of up to 100 new homes on this site is disproportionate to the existing neighbourhood. Although we recognise that 100 homes is a reduction from the 175 homes specified in last year’s draft local plan, it is still an overpowering number of new homes in comparison with existing housing on neighbouring roads (Ridgemount, Alresford, Scholars Walk etc). Ridgemount and Alresford Road are minor roads with pedestrian pathways down only one side of the road. The additional traffic generated by 100 new homes would completely change the nature of these peaceful roads and would exacerbate the existing congestion problems on Madrid Road, Guildford Park Road and into Guildford Town centre. Further, it would put considerable additional pressure on the local infrastructure and amenities, such as schools, doctors surgeries etc.

In conclusion, we ask that this site should remain designated as protected open space and that the proposal to redesignate this site as C3 Housing be reconsidered and withdrawn.

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

Attached documents:
I would like to object to the proposed housing plan on the land of Guildford cathedral. Already we have major pedestrian problems as well as obscured views when leaving our driveways. We are living on a semi rural road, which already has its problems, including drainage. I'm also not happy with the cathedral not wanting access from its main entrance whilst they are happy to burden their immediate neighbours with the added traffic and obscured views.

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

Attached documents:

The land on the slopes of Stag Hill was designated Protected Open Space in 2003. There is no good reason to change this now. Guildford town centre needs its green spaces protecting, not eroding, especially in light of the vast tracks of housing development along the river / railway.

In addition the change of status would impact on the local community and the very unique nature of the Ridgemount / Arlesford environ, where an almost country side feel has been established in the heart of Guildford. The hedgerows backing onto the Cathedral fields are very much part of this, as is the housing only on one side of the road. Plus the views of the Cathedral from the opposite slopes of the Downs are magnificent and need protecting from urban sprawl.

I would significantly question the rationale for this change which seems to be purely based on the Cathedral's planning application to develop the site. It seems to be an example of cronyism.

It is very evident that this site is not appropriate for building due to (i) its history of problems relating to subsidence and drainage, (ii) extensive piling would be required to develop with consequent repercussions on neighbouring houses in Ridgemount, Arlesford Road, Benbrick Road, Stag Hill, and Scholars Walk, (iii) the rainwater run-off from the site has caused drainage and minor flooding issues, particularly affecting Ridgemount, which would be exacerbated by further development, (iv) there is a well-documented traffic problem in this area which is only going to be made worse by the proposals for development of Guildford Park Car Park and Guildford Station. The addition of 100 houses on the Cathedral hill site will add in excess of 150 vehicles to this already problematic scenario, and (v) the reason for change of status is political rather than the suitability of the site for housing.

I therefore object to the change in status of this site to C3 housing on the grounds that it is inappropriate for development due its location, and any development would have a negative impact on the surrounding community.

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

Attached documents:
I wish to register my objection please to the change in status of this site to C3 housing on the grounds as detailed well by Olive Edwards in her email below.

In addition I wish to raise that I have two young and we live in Scholars Walk - not a week goes by whereby we don't walk around enjoying the cathedral grounds. To lose that green open space would be a real loss to us personally as a family, forcing our children to play more in the streets which as a knock on effect would become less safe if we saw a significant increase in cars using Ridgemount.

**Policy A15 - land at Guildford Cathedral**

"This site was designated Protected Open Space in 2003 for good reason and I would say that it is even more important now to keep this area as a green space as every town needs to have several open spaces, particularly in light of current Government housing policy and the excessive degree of development in Guildford since that time.

A change of status would impact on the local community in terms of its local character, particularly for roads such as Ridgemount and Arlesford Road which currently have a semi rural feel to them as they are bounded by the ancient historic tithe hedge which forms part of the currently designated open space, as well as the visual quality of the site. The setting it provides for the Cathedral and the views of the Cathedral throughout Guildford as a whole ("a jewel in an emerald sea") will be irreparably damaged. I would therefore question the rationale for this change which seems to be based purely on the Cathedral's proposal to develop the site. It is evident that this site is not appropriate for building as due to its nature and history of problems relating to subsidence and drainage, extensive piling would be required to accommodate any development with consequent repercussions on neighbouring houses in roads such as Ridgemount, Arlesford Road, Benbrick Road, Stag Hill, Scholars Walk etc. Furthermore the rainwater run-off from the site has caused drainage and minor flooding issues, particularly affecting Ridgemount, which would be exacerbated by further development. It would seem that the reason for change of status is political rather than based on the suitability of the site for housing, which is plainly not.

There is a well-documented major traffic problem in this area already which is only going to be made worse by the current proposals for development of Guildford Park Car Park and Guildford Station. The addition of 100 houses on the Cathedral hill site will add in excess of 100 vehicles to this already problematic scenario as well as having wider implications for the immediate infrastructure of the neighbourhood.

In view of the vote to leave the European Union the housing need for Guildford is likely to change in the near future and alteration of the current status of the site in question may well turn out to be a hasty decision to be later repented at leisure.

In summary I object to the change in status of this site to C3 housing on the grounds that it is inappropriate for development due its nature and any development would have a negative impact on the surrounding community both in terms of impact on the setting of the cathedral and the local infrastructure. I sincerely hope that you will take these points into consideration during your deliberations on the status of the Cathedral hill site”

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

**Attached documents:**
The draft local plan allocates “site 43: land at Guildford Cathedral” as Housing (C3)

I object to the redesignation of this land, from the 2003 allocation as Protected Open Space to a proposed allocation in 2016 as “Housing C3”, on the following grounds:

The National Planning Policy Framework states that open space should not be built on unless it has been shown to be surplus to requirements. I do not believe this land to be surplus to requirements and have seen no assessment showing it to be so. The area proposed to be redesignated, to the south and east of the Cathedral, as others have highlighted is an important area of green open space in close proximity to the town centre. It is important both in terms of its recreational utility and the aesthetic it contributes to the setting of this listed building, impacting on views from near and far due to the height of the land and cathedral building.

All other sites listed for housing/development in the Guildford urban area are brownfield sites. Developing this land should be a last resort, changing its designation from Protected Open Space to Housing means that it is seen as equal to brownfield sites in terms of its attractiveness for development.

I am not convinced that the development of this land is of benefit for the people of Guildford. The people of Guildford and visitors will lose the use of the land (originally given to the people of Guildford and placed under the Cathedral’s stewardship), our views will be adversely affected, traffic will increase significantly in an already busy area and local infrastructure (eg schools already oversubscribed, drainage and roads) will require additional investment.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this

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

Attached documents:
I have been reading about this proposed development for some time now.

Like many local residents I've been surprised and unhappy about development in an already over populated area.

As a resident in Old Palace Road I, like the rest of my owner occupier neighbours have put up with the result of an over expanding University.

The infill structure is so woefully inadequate to accommodate permanent residents and the student population, although through no real fault of their own have totally dominated and degraded the area through their lack of education in how to live in a community.

The greed of the University and possibly the council has sustained this problem and it continues.

My point is that we in the Guildford Park area have had enough!

It's a extremely stupid idea to build houses on the proposed site.

The ground is not fit to accommodate housing as has been proved and shown.

The area is already swamped with cars resulting in an already grid lock situation morning, evening and school pick up times.

I'm sure that the reasons all ready stated re the hedges and trees are very valid but on the infill structure and ground conditions alone surely this is a bonkers idea!?

I really can't understand why obviously intelligent people can think it a good, reasonable and viable one!

As for the powers that be at the Cathedral shame on you.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2789  **Respondent:** 17359489 / R & R Connor  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A15

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

Guildford Town Centre Site Allocation A15 Land at Guildford Cathedral, Alresford Road.

We are concerned with new wording of requirements: point 4 on page 176; ' A holistic approach to the landscaping of the site to include no unacceptable impact on existing trees and mature hedges of significance'.

The word 'unacceptable ' is a vague term subject to interpretation, whereas the original wording: 'protect existing trees and mature hedges of significance is more precise.

Please also clarify the use of the words of 'significance' does this encompass not only the TPO's but also the Tithe hedge bounding the site? This hedge, and one other, both have continuous lengths of more than 20metres and have been in existence for 30 years or more, and so satisfies at least one of the criteria listed in part II of schedule 1 of the Hedgerow Regulations 1997.
The new vague wording should not replace the clearer existing ones, which instead should be strengthened and clarified.

Crucially, we believe the site should REMAIN designated as a protected open space with a small number of Cathedral houses. It is inappropriate to designate this particular site as C3 Housing.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Water Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42310</td>
<td>A15 - Land At Guildford Cathedral, Alresford Road, Guildford</td>
<td>The water network capacity in this area may be unable to support the demand anticipated from this development. Local upgrades to the existing water network infrastructure may be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. The developer is encouraged to work Thames Water early on in the planning process to understand what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Waste Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On the information available to date we do not envisage wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Attached documents:

Total records: 23.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A16 - Land between Gill Avenue and Rosalind Franklin Close, Guildford
## Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3915</th>
<th>Respondent: 8561377 / The Guildford Society (Julian Lyon)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A16</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land between Gill Avenue and Rosalind Franklin Close, Guildford – We recognise the need to include the provision to support the Sustainable Movement Corridor. We have prepared a paper in response to the Council’s proposed route that helps to connect sites like this to the movement corridor. This will be an important part of linking development to public transport and alternatives to the car.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1196</th>
<th>Respondent: 8729313 / Lisa Wright</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A16</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPORT. But homes must be affordable for Hospital staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/988</th>
<th>Respondent: 8848033 / Paul Gerrard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A16</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to additional housing on this site. This is a previously developed site, so makes sense to redevelop it. However, it is within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, and therefore any redevelopment, especially for housing, is subject to EU/UK legislation (NPPF 119). The impact of development cannot be mitigated with SANGs because at present there is no evidence base to support SANGs as required by NRM6 viii, NPPF 158 and 166.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7858</th>
<th>Respondent: 8967233 / University of Surrey (University of Surrey)</th>
<th>Agent: Terence O'Rourke (Luke Vallins)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A16</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The University notes the proposed allocation of Land between Gill Avenue and Franklin Close for approximately 450 homes, potentially including some student accommodation.

The University supports, in principle, the potential for the delivery of some student accommodation as part of this allocation, which would result in the provision of additional accommodation that could be available to meet the University’s growing student population.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Site A16 Land**

**at Gill Avenue**

| Do you consider this section of the plan is legally compliant? | Yes |
| Do you consider this section of the plan is sound? | Yes |
| Do you consider this section of the document complies with the Duty to cooperate? | Yes |

The A2Dominion Group has a ground lease on land within site Policy 16. A2Dominion are supportive of the proposed allocation for Policy A16 and A17. It is a core principle of the Group to continually look to improve their accommodation and services across all of its sectors which include key worker, student, social and market accommodation. Policy sites A16 and A17 provide the potential to provide high quality key worker accommodation for the hospital’s need, and much needed market accommodation. The A2Dominion Group in principle would support collaboratively working with Royal Surrey County Hospital to explore opportunities to improve the existing environment within the site.

A proposal that could incorporate strategically relocating existing key worker accommodation for hospital staff, and indeed potentially increasing the quantum of
such accommodation is something A2Dominion wholly support, as it also provides the opportunity to deliver the highest standard of modern accommodation going forward. This is key for attracting and retaining the highest quality of staff for the hospital for the services and care it provides for the local community.

If you are proposing a change to the Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy Yes No

and sites, do you wish to express an interest in participating at the Examination? Yes

Why do you wish to participate at the Examination?

It is important that A2Dominion are represented at the Examination in order to support the identification of the site for development, confirm the land is available and developable to enable the allocation to proceed with confidence and provide evidence on any general matters regarding the site which may arise at the Examination.

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

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1531  **Respondent:** 15234561 / Royal Surrey County Hospital (Alf Turner)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A16

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

Policy (A16) – Land between Gill Avenue and Rosalind Franklin Close:

We believe that this site is currently allocated correctly as residential category C3 or potentially C4. In the opportunities section please can we have a new opportunity for potential key worker housing provision added.

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

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7807  **Respondent:** 15674273 / Savills for Thames Water (Katherine Jones)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A16

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

On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.
We have concerns regarding Wastewater Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.

There is a history of some sewer flooding. Developer funded impact study required to understand implications of development.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2452  Respondent: 17308705 / University of Surrey (University of Surrey .)  Agent: Terence O'Rourke (Steve Molnar)

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A16

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

POLICY A16: Land between Gill Avenue and Rosalind Franklin Close, Guildford

The University supports the addition of ‘sui generis’ to the use class for student accommodation, and the reference to the sustainable movement corridor SPD. We would add that key worker homes for the hospital would also be appropriate as part of the mix at this site and this could be referred to in the policy.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4807  Respondent: 17484449 / Thames Water Utilities Ltd (Sir or Madam)  Agent: Savills (Richard Hill)

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A16

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Water Response</th>
<th>Waste Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51753</td>
<td>A16 - Land Between Gill Avenue and Rosalind Franklin Close, Guildford</td>
<td>The water network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Strategic water supply infrastructure upgrades are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. The developer is encouraged to work Thames Water early on in the planning process to understand what water infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered.</td>
<td>The wastewater network capacity in this area may be unable able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Local upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are may be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a potential wastewater network capacity constraint, the developer should liaise with Thames Water to determine whether a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered is required. The detailed drainage strategy should be submitted with the planning application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Attached documents:
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A17 - Land south of Royal Surrey County Hospital, Rosalind Franklin Close, Guildford
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3918  **Respondent:** 8561377 / The Guildford Society (Julian Lyon)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A17

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

Land south of Royal Surrey County Hospital, Rosalind Franklin Close, Guildford – We recognise the need to include the provision to support the Sustainable Movement Corridor. We have prepared a paper in response to the Council’s proposed route that helps to connect sites like this to the movement corridor. This will be an important part of linking development to public transport and alternatives to the car.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7859  **Respondent:** 8967233 / University of Surrey (University of Surrey)  **Agent:** Terence O'Rourke (Luke Vallins)

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A17

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

The University supports this allocation for hospital-related development, provided the impact on the local highway network is taken fully into consideration.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/8323  **Respondent:** 8969441 / A2D Dominion New Homes  **Agent:** Barton Willmore (Simon Potts)

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A17

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

Site A17 Land south of RSCH

Do you consider this section of the plan is legally compliant?  Yes

Do you consider this section of the plan is sound?  Yes

Do you consider this section of the document complies with the Duty to
The A2Dominion Group has a ground lease on land within site Policy 16. A2Dominion are supportive of the proposed allocation for Policy A16 and A17. It is a core principle of the Group to continually look to improve their accommodation and services across all of it’s sectors which include key worker, student, social and market accommodation. Policy sites A16 and A17 provide the potential to provide high quality key worker accommodation for the hospital’s need, and much needed market accommodation. The A2Dominion Group in principle would support collaboratively working with Royal Surrey County Hospital to explore opportunities to improve the existing environment within the site.

A proposal that could incorporate strategically relocating existing key worker accommodation for hospital staff, and indeed potentially increasing the quantum of such accommodation is something A2Dominion wholly support, as it also provides the opportunity to deliver the highest standard of modern accommodation going forward. This is key for attracting and retaining the highest quality of staff for the hospital for the services and care it provides for the local community.

If you are proposing a change to the Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites, do you wish to express an interest in participating at the Examination? Yes

Why do you wish to participate at the Examination?

It is important that A2Dominion are represented at the Examination in order to support the identification of the site for development, confirm the land is available and developable to enable the allocation to proceed with confidence and provide evidence on any general matters regarding the site which may arise at the Examination.

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

Attached documents:

---

Policy (A17) – Land south of Royal Surrey County Hospital, Rosalind Franklin Close Guildford:

This site is currently allocated for hospital related development and is currently occupied by a temporary car park known as ‘plot 23’. We would like this site to be re-allocated as residential category C3/C4 as above. We would also like to have a new opportunity listed here for potential key worker housing provision.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2453  Respondent: 17308705 / University of Surrey (University of Surrey .)  Agent: Terence O'Rourke (Steve Molnar)

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A17

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
POLICY A17: Land south of RSCH

The University supports the reference to the sustainable movement corridor SPD in this policy. Given its sustainable location key worker homes and student housing as part of the mix of ‘hospital related development’ would be appropriate and could be referred to in the policy.

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

Attached documents:

Total records: 5.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A18 - Land at Guildford College, Guildford
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Comment ID: pslp172/3917  Respondent: 8561377 / The Guildford Society (Julian Lyon)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A18

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

Land at Guildford College, Guildford – We note that Application 17/P/00509 seeks to develop this site for 527 bedspaces by contrast to the allocation for 200 (increased from 100 in the previous draft). The Guildford Society has made representation in respect of the Planning Application, but wishes to note that we are keen to ensure the viability of Guildford College, whilst also being concerned to retain the openness of Stoke Park and the long range views from the park to the Cathedral and vice versa.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/989  Respondent: 8848033 / Paul Gerrard  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A18

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

I object to housing on this site. This is a previously developed site, so makes sense to redevelop it. However, it was not previously used for housing and is within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, and therefore any redevelopment, especially for housing, is subject to EU/UK legislation (NPPF 119). The impact of development cannot be mitigated with SANGs because at present there is no evidence base to support SANGs as required by NRM6 viii, NPPF 158 and 166.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1105  Respondent: 10954913 / Pete Rollo  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A18

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

This housing is in an inappropriate location. We should preserve the site for other purposes. the subsequent overloading of facilities will be intolerable: roads, schools, medical facilities and parking will be negatively affected.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1128  Respondent: 15272929 / roger kendall  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A18
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3266</th>
<th>Respondent: 15495873 / Gerard Duvé</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A18</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td><strong>I object to removal of sites A4, Telephone Exchange and A18, Guildford College as they would provide 200 homes in sustainable location, and 100 homes at A33, Broadford Business Park.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7808</th>
<th>Respondent: 15674273 / Savills for Thames Water (Katherine Jones)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A18</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td><strong>We have concerns regarding Water Supply Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the water network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing water infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed water supply strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.</strong></td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4293</th>
<th>Respondent: 17466433 / Stone Grove Stoke Park Limited</th>
<th>Agent: Montagu Evans LLP (Montagu Evans)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A18</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unfortunately the college is going through a difficult time, possibly through poor leadership. If it sells off its property it will not be in a position to take advantage of a future improvement in the college operation. This is short term thinking which should be avoided.
The Site is currently vacant brownfield land within Guildford College Campus. Please find a red line site plan enclosed (Enclosure 1). The Site was last used by the College for Construction and Engineering buildings in excess of 18 months ago and have been vacant ever since.

The land has now been declared as surplus land by the College and as such, the College fully support the principle of the redevelopment of the Site.

Following a period of marketing, no alternative community based uses identified an interest in the whole of the site, with the exception of a nursery (circa 150 sqm), all interest came from alternative uses, including student accommodation.

Guildford has the largest population of all Surrey towns and has a high concentration of learning institutions. These include the University of Surrey, Guildford School of Acting, the University of Law, Guildford College, the Academy of Contemporary Music and the School of Horticulture at RHS Wisley.

The West Surrey SHMA (2015) estimates that the University of Surrey expects a growth of up to 6,300 additional student’s over the period to 2033 with 3,300 additional students over the next decade.

The Site therefore represents an important development opportunity to provide student accommodation in Guildford. Redeveloping the site would also make the best use of an available site which is previously developed land.

An application for planning permission for the redevelopment of the Site for student accommodation was submitted in March 2017 (17/P/00509) on behalf of our client, and proposed the following:

“Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment to provide purpose built student accommodation with 553 bedspaces, 149 sqm D1 floorspace, 969 sqm of student amenity space including a gym and student hub and associated works”

Following extensive consultation with the LPA and interested parties, amendments were made to the pending planning application in June 2017. As a result of the submitted amendments, the scheme will now deliver 527 units.

This application has not yet been decided by GBC.

Policy A18 of the Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2017 allocates the site for 200 student beds spaces and at least 500 sqm of D1 floorspace. This is an amendment from the 2016 consultation of the Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites, which identified the site as having capacity for 100 homes.

We welcome the inclusion of the Site as one of the draft allocations identified to deliver student accommodation plus D1 floorspace, and we support the Council’s recognition of the Sites suitability for student accommodation. However, we consider that the proposed allocation does not optimise the Sites redevelopment potential and we therefore object to the aforementioned capacity.

The detailed planning application that has been submitted has been informed by a robust design process, having regards to all the opportunities and constraints of the site. Consequently, we consider that any allocation should more appropriately identify the sites capacity as circa 527 bedspaces.

The Site is brownfield land and the NPPF seeks to optimise the redevelopment of brownfield land. In addition, the Council state a key objective of the Plan is to maintain the extent of Green Belt land. The redevelopment of brownfield land, would promote this objective and help ensure the identified student housing needs are met in the most sustainable way.

Section 6 of the NPPF seeks to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, with paragraph 47 seeking to boost the supply of housing. This is reiterated in the plan as a key objective of the proposed Plan is to deliver new housing. Draft Policy H1, ‘Homes for all’, specifically states that this includes housing for students.
The delivery of purpose built accommodation will therefore reduce the reliance on HMO’s and will have the additional benefit of alleviating pressure on Guildford’s private housing market, which is an important factor given that the Council have an identified need for both student accommodation and private market housing.

In addition there is an identified need within the Borough for student accommodation and increasing the capacity of this allocation would better optimise the development potential of a previously developed site.

As such, in accordance with the NPPF and indeed the Council’s own proposed policies, the proposed site allocation identifies a missed opportunity to fully utilise the redevelopment potential of the Site and as such, we would suggest an increased capacity circa 527 units would be appropriate, which reflects the currently pending application.

We do, however, have concerns that the Plan does not identify the full potential of the Site as an allocated site to deliver student accommodation. We consider an increase in the allocated capacity to be a significant benefit to achieving the Council’s need for student housing, whilst also alleviating pressure on the Council’s need for housing.

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

Attached documents: Local_Plan_Strategy_and_Sites_2017_Representations.pdf (445 KB)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Water Response</th>
<th>Waste Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51754</td>
<td>Land at Guildford College Campus, Stoke Road, Guildford, GU1 1EZ</td>
<td>The water network capacity in this area may be unable to support the demand anticipated from this development. Local upgrades to the existing water network infrastructure may be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. The developer is encouraged to work Thames Water early on in the planning process to understand what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered</td>
<td>On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Attached documents:
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A19 - Land at Westway, off Aldershot Road, Guildford
## Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2440  **Respondent:** 8559041 / Beverley Mussell  **Agent:**
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</th>
<th>is Sound?</th>
<th>is Legally Compliant?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy A19 relating to the development of the old Puttocks car park - “Land off Westway etc...” Conditional support for this proposal.

This vacant piece of land is adjacent to the Northern boundary of the Aldershot Road allotment site. It is an area once used as a truck dealership. It housed a large building and bitumen car park. The building has been demolished leaving a concreted area. The bitumen car park contains the vehicular right of way to the Aldershot Road allotment site and the six allocated parking spaces for tenants as mentioned in Policy 21.

This will be a difficult and costly development to deliver. The concrete needs to be removed. The land is at the base of the hill of the allotment site and pile driven supports will be necessary to stop the proposed dwellings from sliding into the school below.

Already there have been “behind closed doors” negotiations to enhance the development delivery of this land. These have involved the suggested loss of the lower vehicular access to the allotment site and also the relocation of its lower parking spaces. The retention of this lower access for vehicles is crucial for the viability of the allotment site as 80% of tenants use this access. The safety of tenants is also a major concern as this is the only safe access for emergency vehicles.

The key considerations as defined in Policy A19 need to be adhered to.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3919  **Respondent:** 8561377 / The Guildford Society (Julian Lyon)  **Agent:**
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</th>
<th>is Sound?</th>
<th>is Legally Compliant?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Land at Westway, off Aldershot Road, Guildford – There were no amendments to this policy.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1012  **Respondent:** 8608865 / WBDRA. (David Bird)  **Agent:**
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</th>
<th>is Sound?</th>
<th>is Legally Compliant?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>,</td>
<td>,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WBDRA would like to comment further on this policy.
Yes we are in favour of housing on this site especially as the landowners indicated that the said homes would be smaller scale and possibly affordable homes as opposed to 38 x 3-4 bed homes which the area does not need.

What WBDRA OBJECTS to is the threatened loss of the Allotment Main Access gate which is situated in the Car Park area. Yes there are rights & easements of passage which we hope will be observed and retained BUT it is apparent from discussions between Guildford Borough Council & Guildford Allotment Society that this may not be so. WBRDA INSISTS that the main Allotment Site gate (often referred to as the "lower gate" will stay where it is with passage remaining for both vehicles and pedestrians

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6067</th>
<th>Respondent: 8608865 / WBDRA. (David Bird)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to this policy not because of the intended housing development but because of the loss of the Aldershot Road Allotment Site main access gate and our 6 Car Parking Spaces.

Despite what it says in Policy A19, I understand that Guildford Borough Council in tandem with Guildford Allotments Society have plans to remove the gate and relocate the Car Parking spaces as part of the Housing Development Delivery

I and many other Allotment tenants hope this will not be the case but we have seen Council correspondence which suggests it has been or is being considered.

Accordingly I cannot support any Housing development which will deprive a great many Allotment tenants, myself included, of their primary access to the Allotment Site.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4524</th>
<th>Respondent: 8627393 / Worplesdon Parish Council (Gaynor White)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A19

Land at Westway, off Aldershot Road – 38 homes Support.

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

Attached documents:

<p>| Comment ID: PSLPS16/990 | Respondent: 8848033 / Paul Gerrard | Agent: |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/8302</th>
<th>Respondent: 8902689 / Lyndell Mussell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )</strong>, is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to housing on this site. This is a previously developed site, so makes sense to redevelop it. However, it was not previously used for housing and is within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, and therefore any redevelopment, especially for housing, is subject to EU/UK legislation (NPPF 119). The impact of development cannot be mitigated with SANGs because at present there is no evidence base to support SANGs as required by NRM6 viii, NPPF 158 and 166.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6672</th>
<th>Respondent: 8974177 / Nigel Mitchell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )</strong>, is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy A19 - 38 proposed dwellings on brownfield vacant land adjacent the Aldershot Road allotment site. The key considerations as defined in this policy need to be adhered to otherwise the future of the Aldershot Road allotment site could be compromised and tenants put at risk should an emergency vehicle be needed on site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/686</th>
<th>Respondent: 15228257 / T Cornell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )</strong>, is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a parent for St Josephs Catholic Primary School, I do not support the idea of building extra 38 houses on West Way Road (former car park). I feel that the area is already densely developed and further housing will put more pressure on existing infrastructure which is already suffering.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/722  **Respondent:** 15233377 / Stephen Macfarlane  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A19

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

As a local parent whose children are and will use the adjacent school, I would like to oppose this planning application for new housing.

currently it is very difficult to park or drop off and collect the children at peak hours.

any further housing is likely to add up to 2 extra cars per house using the existing limited infrastructure.

i do not see any proposals from the developer to aid or compliment the local ergonomics.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/749  **Respondent:** 15235265 / Michael Curlis  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A19

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

The obvious issues are that Park and ride were deemed a necessity hence this area turned into a car park bringing more dangers to area which has a growing and substantial school population no long term thinking going on there.

Now greed has kicked in and you are hoping to do away with this parking area, so where will these cars which use this site go.

You are considering building 38 homes so lets say each property has a min 2 car property 76 more cars in the area, of which about 38 actual spaces will be made for the 78 cars for these potential new residents.

Adding to parking issues in this area.

Currently school play areas are not sufficient why not turn some of this area into school field and use.

Oh yes that's right not enough money would be made out of this.

mmmmmm
Now lets have a think about this while working class family are squeezed into a smaller and smaller living area with pot holed roads. (Northway and side road along Aldershot road where frail OAP live, I'm sure you have not noticed only been like this for the last 5 years).

Students packed into ex family homes ruining the mix of the area, devaluing house prices.

I have an idea, there is lots of lovely space around Albury, Chilworth Shalford, Merrow, Clandon, Shamley Green, Atrington, Puttenham.

Maybe some of these areas could absorb the flow of Migrants and the need for new builds to a growing population.

But no this will not happen why!

Oh yes you guys live there hey or your cohorts.

So hey ho another 38 homes whacked into an overcrowded area more pollution and fumes.

Cycles lanes for who? Not my Kids to dangerous.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6102  Respondent: 15273377 / Tracey Geaves  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A19

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

As a tenant of the allotments on the site adjacent to the allocated for new homes I have no objection to these being built. I would just like to stress how important it is that the land used for allotments is not disturbed whilst any development takes place.

After reading the Proposed Submission Local Plan I was surprised to see that allotments in general are not included in the description of blue and green infrastructure under Policy I4. Allotments meet the needs of relaxation, exercise, recreation, visual amenity, wildlife habitat and agriculture just as much, if not more, the parks, open spaces, private gardens, agricultural fields and woodland listed so should certainly be included.

To give you an example, last week I visited the allotments early in the morning only to find a hedgehog on my plot. This is the first hedgehog I have seen living wild during my 36 years. This illustrates the need to avoid disruption to the wildlife on the adjacent site.

It is also essential that the access to the lower end of the site, off Westway, remains the same as it currently is. The allotment land slopes sharply down to this access point and this is really the only suitable access point for most of the site by vehicle. It is regularly needed by tenants transporting heavy items, such as garden tools or plants, to their allotments and would be essential for an emergency services vehicle in the case of accident. A number of then tenants are elderly would struggle without the use of this access.

Allotments also contribute greatly to the local community, in an age where many people no longer interact with their neighbours they provide a way of meeting local people with shared interests. They encourage healthy eating and regular exercise as well improving mental health.
Looking at the size of the site for the proposed new homes I wouldn’t expect each of the 38 houses to have its own green outdoor space so the allotments would therefore be a benefit to new residents, both visually and as potential allotment tenants.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3252  Respondent: 15443201 / St Josephs Catholic Primary School (Michael Stokes)

Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A19

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

Policy A19: Land at Westway, off Aldershot Road, Guildford.

The Governing Body of StJoseph's Catholic Primary School, Guildford, would like to comment on the proposed site allocation for approximately 38 homes (C3).

We would like to state that we have no objections to this land being used for housing, as we are very aware that homes, especially affordable family homes, are needed in Guildford.

However, we would like point out some key considerations applicable to this site:

1) Traffic movement - there have been two serious accidents outside of the school in recent months.

2) Parking - there is very little parking available in the vicinity of the school, leading to dangerous and anti social parking in the local streets. We believe that generous parking facilities should be available for residents and their visitors on this site.

Both of the above are, of course, a major safety concern for us.

3) The school has recently extended to a three term entry and further expansion on our site is not possible. With pupil numbers at 631, the school is over PAN, and oversubscribed, as are all local primary schools. Planning for additional school places should be taken into consideration.

4) The site boundary runs the full length of the school boundary. Consideration should be given to height and density, with "overlooking" issues relating to School Consideration should be given to height and density, with 'overlooking' issues relating to School and Play areas - Policy H1: Homes for all, and Policy 01: Making better places.

5) The school has a plot on the Westborough Allotment which is used every week and is much valued by the children and the school. Continued safe and easy access is paramount. With respect to rights and easements and the right to park, the spaces allocated for users of the allotments is essential, as they provide an important mentoring role for our children.

We would expect the drainage ditch to be maintained as part of any planning approval.

We would like to request that the concerns that the school has in respect of this unusual site be taken into consideration at the outset of the planning process, that they be added to the Key Considerations, and that they be kept on record for when a planning brief is prepared.

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

Attached documents:
This site falls outside of Thames Water’s water supply boundary.

On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Site ID** | **Site Name** | **Water Response** | **Waste Response**
--- | --- | --- | ---
42315 | A19 - Land At Westway, Off Aldershot Road, Guildford | On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Water Supply capability in relation to this site. | On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.

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

**Attached documents:**

Total records: 15.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A20 - Former Pond Meadow School, Pond Meadow, Guildford
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1016  Respondent: 8608865 / WBDRA. (David Bird)  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A20
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

WBDRA SUPPORTS this policy which will provide much needed community assets.

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

Comment ID: PSLPS16/387  Respondent: 10798049 / Steve & Maureen Knight  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A20
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Support – a viable site

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

Comment ID: pslp172/3572  Respondent: 15629025 / Surrey County Council (Sir or madam)  Agent: Vail Williams LLP (James Williams)
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A20
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Site Specific Comments: A20

Surrey County Council support the proposed allocation of site A20 (Former Pond Meadow School) and confirm it is available for a minimum of 10 residential units or, if no other SCC operational requirements, solely residential or extra care at an appropriate density for an urban site as determined through the detailed design process.

Previous Site Specific Submissions

All sites previously submitted through the Guildford LAA processes are still considered suitable and available for development, particularly the Countryside Depot (East Horsley) and the land between Oxenden Road and the A331. We encourage GBC to review and positively consider these sites and would welcome the opportunity to discuss further, especially if the housing requirement for the Borough increases. These sites can positively contribute to the OAN (housing numbers) over the plan period, subject to any operational requirements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:
This site falls outside of Thames Water’s water supply boundary.

On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.

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

Attached documents:
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A21 - Aldershot Road allotments, Guildford
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8111  **Respondent:** 8556385 / Guildford Residents Association, EGRA (Amanda Mullarkey)  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21

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

A21: Land at Westborough allotments

Welcome

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4274  **Respondent:** 8556385 / Guildford Residents Association, EGRA (Amanda Mullarkey)  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A21

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

Welcome

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2439  **Respondent:** 8559041 / Beverley Mussell  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21

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

Policy A21 Strong support

Land at Westborough Allotments – correct title – Aldershot Road allotments according to Leasing Agreement between landowners Guildford Borough Council and managing agents Guildford Allotments Society.

This allotment site should be returned to its original use as all allotments.

Allotments have proven health benefits. They promote healthy exercise and outdoor activity. They encourage the growing of fresh produce and its consumption. This helps combat obesity.

They also promote social cohesion as plot-holders are an eclectic mix of ages, religions, nationalities and personalities. All are bound by a common love of gardening. Loneliness and isolation are disturbing factors in modern society but there's always someone to talk to on an allotment site and inhibiting factors such as wealth and class are missing.
Westborough is officially described as a deprived area and Project “Aspire” has been started to address this. This allotment site has its own site association - Westborough Allotments Self Help Association) - (WASHA) - which co-operates,agrees and helps with the aims of “Aspire”.

Aldershot Road site has an educational program set up with funding by Big Lottery Local Food - WASHA Family Food Mentoring Program in 2009. This is on going and Local Food monitors have commended WASHA on its successful implementation. It teaches newcomers how to grow food. It provides mentors for management and teaching for 90 plus children each year on the St Joseph’s school plot. Children are taught that food has to be grown. It doesn't just appear in a supermarket. They realise by the end of their school year of working on their plot, that it is not easy to grow food and food should never be wasted. They also get a chance to sample the wide variety of produce which they grow and harvest on their plot.

The whole site is an island of biodiversity set amongst the urban sprawl of Guildford. Allotment holders are keen conservationists and there are many plot-holders with specialist knowledge of butterflies, bats, birds, insects and wild-flowers. A wide variety of cultivation methods are used including organic and Permaculture from which others can learn sustainable agriculture principles.

UK has a large food deficit and every allotment site should be valued for its contribution to the UK’s food production. Surpluses from this site go out to the local churches, North Guildford Food bank as well as feeding the families of the plot-holders themselves. It has no “food miles” and its production is sustainable.

The decision to return the whole site to allotments is correct and nothing should be done to put the survival of this site in jeopardy. It has been used as allotments since before the First World War.

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

Attached documents:
I support the policy of using the land at Westborough off of the Aldershot Road as allotment land.

Allotments are a vital part of the green infrastructure of Guildford and provide excellent facilities for local residents to grow their own vegetables and fruit, exercise at their own pace and meet and socialise with other local residents from all parts of the community.

Allotments also enhance the biodiversity of the area and therefore support Policy I4 (Green and Blue Infrastructure).

It would also be helpful if allotments were specifically included in the list of green spaces in the definition of "green and blue infrastructure" in para 4.6.31 of the draft plan (page 116).

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

Attached documents:
Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4194  Respondent: 8627393 / Worplesdon Parish Council (Gaynor White)  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A21
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

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

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5374  Respondent: 8673281 / Ian Weemes  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

These allotments are too important to many people, I fully support the above policy
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4471  Respondent: 8674017 / Janet Bird  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am in total support of this policy A21.
Please, please keep the Aldershot Road allotment site for ALLOTMENTS, and ALLOTMENTS ONLY - NOT HOUSES..
We are losing all the green areas in the North West side of Guildford as opposed to other parts of the town. Houses are being shoe horned everywhere we look. Allotments are the very few areas of green land that we have in the GU3 area.
Allotments are increasingly popular, as can be seen by the waiting lists. Allotments not only give fresh air and exercise to those who don't have gardens, but a seasonal supply of fresh produce, organic and with no carbon footprint. The children at St Joseph's school have one and thoroughly enjoy their days out there.
The allotments attract all sorts of wildlife too, we have a bee keeper with 4 hives, and as we all know, bees are on the decline in this country and we need to encourage them.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/5967  Respondent: 8674273 / Rachel May  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21

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

I am in agreement to these allotments staying in the Guildford Plan.

I have had a plot there for nearly 9 years, and although it is hard work, it is great to be able to provide my family with organic food, with minimal carbon footprint and lots of healthy exercise. I am able to make enough jam from the plot to keep my family going all year, and have jar of preserved cherries still from last year. It is an amazing resource as our garden is not big enough to grow vegetables in.

There is a tremendous mix of people on site, people from many nation, and walks of life. All mixing together, and many working on the community plot that supports the locals school.

Please keep this green space a green space, and keep the allotments going.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/248  Respondent: 8694849 / David Swinerd  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21

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

I support the proposal to keep the Aldershot Road Allotments as they are with no future development on that site.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/353  Respondent: 8695041 / Malcolm Biffen  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21

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

I agree with this policy to keep the land for allotment use only.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/373  Respondent: 8713953 / Janna Jennings  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I support this policy of retaining this land for allotment use only.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/165  Respondent: 8732641 / John and Katrine Pearson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21

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

my wife and I support this policy of retaining this land for Allotment use.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6162  Respondent: 8733537 / Helen Ward  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21

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

I rented a full sized allotment for 9 years on this, the Aldershot Road site. I had to give it up due to bad knees and my husband was suffering with prostate cancer and I was finding I couldn't devote the time to cultivate such a large plot of land. I did miss it but late last year was offered as much as I thought I could realistically cultivate on what was being set up as a "Community Plot". The idea was to bring people like me back into the allotment community or to let people rent a piece of land which was manageable for tem. My little quarter plot has really given me an escape as I am a carer for my husband who has various metal and physical health issues. I is of a size where I don't have to disappear for an entire day to keep it cultivated.....2 hours is just nice without leaving me feeling guilty and if I can get there in the morning I can do my work and get back home before hubby wakes up!. I also means I can grow fresh vg for my family. I have a large garden but most is unsuitable for veg growing.

This allotment site has been there since before the First World War so is of historical value. They must be protected at all costs and should be included in the list of green spaces within the definition of “green and blue infrastructure” in para 4.6.31 of the draft plan (page 116).

The site also boasts a self help group (WASHA) which runs an educational program for local school children and novice gardeners.

This site must stay and holders also require adequate vehicular access and parking, especially if those who will be loosing their plots on the Bellfields site (also for housing!) wish to relocate to ours.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/356  Respondent: 8736129 / E Stevens  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/384</th>
<th>Respondent: 8736737 / Jill Burrows</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) , is Sound? ( ) , is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strongly support this policy of retaining the land for allotment use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/512</th>
<th>Respondent: 8787297 / Alison Bird</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) , is Sound? ( ) , is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support the Policy 21 that this site is allocated for extra allotments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think this is important because</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• it encourages healthy exercise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• it provides a community and so helps to combat loneliness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• it encourages healthy eating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• it helps with positive mental health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• it increases biodiversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• it provides an outdoor space for people to cultivate who do not have their own garden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• school children use a plot on the site which educates them in growing plants, an important skill for the future as food production will need to increase to provide food for an expanding population.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• encourages good relations with people of all ages, cultures and backgrounds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• decreases 'food miles'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have personally benefited from having an allotment. It gives a sense of relaxation and achievement when I grow something successfully. It also helps me feel part of a community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to me that vehicular access and parking for the allotments is retained at the bottom of the site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5894</th>
<th>Respondent: 8878689 / E McShee</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/8301</td>
<td>Respondent: 8902689 / Lyndell Mussell</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLOTMENTS: Policy A21 strong support. Allotments have proven mental and physical health benefits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments have played an important part in the lives of Guildford residents for many years, providing self sufficiency in vegetables as well as being physically and mentally beneficial to residents. In particular, the Aldershot allotment is unique in that some plot holders have formed a self help group (WASHA) to provide practical assistance to newcomers. The work of this voluntary group has been successful in being awarded a grant from the Lottery Group. The grant was for machinery and tools. Beneficiaries included the local school, who have a plot and are active in growing fruit and vegetables. So successful has the project been that the lottery Group invited WASHA to speak of their project at a conference in Manchester. The conference included other grant recipients from other parts of the country.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4835</th>
<th>Respondent: 8926849 / Christine Giordmaina</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please keep this land for allotments my plot gives me great joy growing fruit and veg, we are a very friendly group of people who are always ready to help one another. The Aldershot Road Allotments is not a BROWN FIELD SITE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6673</th>
<th>Respondent: 8974177 / Nigel Mitchell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A21 Land at Westborough allotments

Support

We need allotments so that people can grow their own vegetables and the land will provide space for invertebrates’ and insects which are as important as dwellings for the continued development of Guildford.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/339  Respondent: 10552033 / Erik Yngvesson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21

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

With regards to the A21 policy: Land at Westborough allotments, I wholeheartedly support the preservation of the allotment for two main reasons:

1) The open green space is a precious commodity, and

2) Potential access to the site via Broadacres would be unsustainable from a traffic perspective.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1559  Respondent: 10636833 / Veronica Denny  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21

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

i am a local resident living at [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998].

Two years before my retirement I applied for an allotment. The reasons being twofold.

1] I live alone and have no close family and was anxious that in some part the loss i would feel of my work colleagues would be diminished if I could establish a new social group through contacts on an allotment. I remembered how beneficial the friends my grandfather had made through his work on his allotment after his wife died in helping him through his loneliness.

2] I am a firm believer in the beneficial effect of being in the open air. My allotment keeps me active and I have the pleasure of giving my surplus produce to some people in social housing who benefit from having their food bills reduced by my gifts of produce, especially really fresh fruit.

If access to the car park off the Aldershot Road was removed I would have to drive through a built up area on a regular basis to access my plot.

---
Additionally it would be too far for me to walk, which is what I do when not needing to take heavy sacks etc to the allotment or bring out and distribute the produce. I am aware that many of my “new friends” also use the Aldershot road access and I feel it should be retained for vehicular use. Without it I would be adding to the carbon footprint of Guildford.

I value my sanctuary of green space, the one air, the bird song, companionship and the reason to get up and keep active even if the weather is not very inviting. Please do not remove a really important green space especially in one of the more built-up areas of Guildford. So please consider the above in relation to point I4.

Thank you for reading my comments.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5371  Respondent: 10653633 / J L Stainer  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to record my support for the retention of the Aldershot Road site as allotment land. The site is well used and very popular and is a welcome green space in our crowded vicinity.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/140  Respondent: 10756801 / John Bird  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I support this policy and am very pleased the council will be retaining this land for Allotment use.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/388  Respondent: 10798049 / Steve & Maureen Knight  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Support – allotment land needed

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

Attached documents:
I am writing in support of Policy A21. (Westbororough Allotments)

My husband is co-owner of one of the allotments and I wanted to get in touch to stress how important this allotment is to my family and the local community.

This allotment provides fresh fruit and vegetables for my family which not only saves us money but ensures we have a healthy diet. There is actually so much produce that grows that we also hand this out to neighbours, friends and people at church so they can also enjoy.

I also want you to be aware of how much enjoyment this allotment brings our family, especially my dad (the other co-owner). He visits it daily, often early in the morning and benefits enormously from the quiet, sanctuary and peace that the allotment brings him. He has a very busy job, works long hours and is constantly in demand. The allotment is his place he can escape to and just enjoy being in the fresh air and enjoying his gardening. It is wonderful that it is so close to home too. He also enjoys taking the grandchildren to visit the allotment and teaching them about how things grow. They love to visit and help to pick and eat the produce.

It would be a tragedy if this allotment space was taken away. Having been there since WW1 it has an historical place in our local community and should be protected as a rare area of green space. There is a real sense of community amongst those who have an allotment and that should be respected. I know there is also a self help group WASHA which runs educational groups for local school children and novice gardeners.

Allotments are so important for the green space of a city and should be protected at all costs so future generations can enjoy them as much as past generations. Therefore I also support Policy I4.

I also want to add that the vehicle access to the Westbororough allotments is also crucial. It is so important to be able to access this area and park. Not only to be able to bring equipment and take produce home easily but also that people often visit early in the morning when they might not feel as safe walking out and about.

I urge you to take serious consideration to the points made and protect these allotments for the good of our community, health, green space and future generations.

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

Attached documents:

---

I would be opposed to any attempt to access this proposed development through the Broadacres / oakfields estate

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

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2796</th>
<th>Respondent: 11008513 / David Masters</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strongly support the policy to retain this allotment space. Allotments are essential community havens that promote mental and physical wellbeing as well as presenting a fairer environment for the community. Losing this space will be another step in a move toward an unhealthy and insular community that doesn't enjoy fresh air, or interactions with their neighbours. Indeed many take a lot of enjoyment in sharing the produce their allotments produce with their friends and neighbours or indeed the elderly or those in need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/125</th>
<th>Respondent: 15111745 / Aderyn Bird</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am e-mailing in relation to the allotment site concerned in Policy A21 and would like to express my utmost support for retaining the whole site as allotments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From my experience, there has been a long waiting list and huge demand for plots on the site as a trend for home-grown food for healthier living increases in popularity. I firmly believe that the fresh air, exercise, and organic produce that comes from owning a plot is highly beneficial in facilitating and maintaining a healthy lifestyle.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am immensely pleased the Council is in favour of retaining the allotment site as part of the Local Plan and wish to continue to support it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/159</th>
<th>Respondent: 15127937 / Alan Burrows</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support this policy of retaining the land for allotments. It is important for the local community and the road infrastructure cannot support the extra traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/422</th>
<th>Respondent: 15137249 / Sue Stubbs</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/220</td>
<td>Respondent: 15140737 / Hazel Killick</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support the plans for retaining the allotments as is on Broadacres - the parking is very bad at the Moment -with the homes as you come into Broadacres park along the road up towards Oakfields - even coaches and taxis!!</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/221</th>
<th>Respondent: 15140769 / Rob Killick</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support this policy of retaining this land for allotment use, as a housing development on this land will create far too much of an increase car traffic through the estate.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/273</th>
<th>Respondent: 15148193 / Ann West</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support the policy of keeping this land for Allotment Use. An important space.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/352</th>
<th>Respondent: 15157057 / Nigel West</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support the plans for retaining the allotments as is on Broadacres - the parking is very bad at the Moment -with the homes as you come into Broadacres park along the road up towards Oakfields - even coaches and taxis!!</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am a tenant at the Aldershot Road allotments. I fully support this site being retained if not extended for allotment use.

My reasons are, I had a breakdown in 2014 and have suffered cognitive disfunction and memory problems as a result. My allotment has been an absolute godsend for my mental health recovery and thus my physical health. I cannot extol the virtues of this community activity enough. Not only being outside but producing crops and meeting all sorts of people from all walks of life and ages with one common aim and hobby, that of growing our own produce to benefit our health.

Aldershot Road allotment site is a sanctuary for myself but many other allotment users. The site is very friendly and allotment holders help each other out and provide both physical assistance but also advice to newcomers. The social aspect of this is enormous for those of us on the site. We have many elderly tenants who clearly thrive on not only the physical aspect of maintaining their allotments but also in being able to converse with individuals and share a common love of gardening. This is enormously beneficial to physical and mental welfare and thus keeping people out of the NHS system.

Adjoining the allotment land to the north between our site and St Josephs school I believe has been ear marked for development for housing. I think such sites are essential for brown field development and the new occupants will benefit from having the allotments beside them.

However, I am deeply concerned about the vehicular access and egress from the allotment sites both during and after construction. My reasons for concern are that with so many elderly tenants I fear that if they were not able to either use the parking spaces provided or gain vehicular access to their plots they will cease holding their plots. This will be detrimental to their physical and mental welfare and detrimental to us as a gardening community as their knowledge will be lost, which they so readily impart to young allotment holders. We also have a significant number of young mothers with toddlers in prams who work their plots. The removal of vehicular access to the site would also put them off from holding allotments. This also will be detrimental to health and the ongoing education of their children about where food comes from etc. In this day and age where we are all acutely aware of the lack of knowledge amongst children about how food is grown and where it comes from etc, this education is crucial, as can be demonstrated by the St Josephs plot. Families working plots together is a joy to behold as the bonds within the families are enriched from this organic process. My biggest concern however about the retention of vehicular access from the bottom of the site is for emergency vehicles. The site needs to enable swift access and egress to such vehicles as with an ageing community on the allotments I have no doubt that we will need this facility at some point.

In any plan for the redevelopment of the old “Puttocks” site, please can there be retained vehicular access and parking for allotment holders to enable this thriving community to continue and keep our elderly tenants active both mentally and physically thus saving the public purse money from not being in the NHS system.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/536  Respondent: 15199777 / Elizabeth Muston  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21

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

Having looked at the the parts of the current draft of the local plan mentioned above, I am writing to support the stated aim of sustainability, and also to support any attempt to maintain diversity of environment within the borough.

1. I see the proposed plan includes the development of much of the riverside through Guildford, a good thing I am sure. However, it must be remembered that biodiversity usually works when rough and/or wild areas are kept, and it may become too organised for much flora and fauna to flourish. The Aldershot Road allotments are quite rough, especially at the top, but also there are many plots which are very diverse, worked as organically as possible, and therefore they need to be protected as in the proposed plan, which is all good. But you do need to address the question of how to promote biodiversity amongst all the proposed new building etc. in places like Woodbridge Meadows. I went past the local cemetery today and although it currently looks as if it needs a bit of tidying up, in fact it is probably a really good thing for the biological infrastructure. Plus, the edges were looking really good, a strip of un-tailored meadow planting by the look of it – excellent. So, actively protect the allotment fields please.

2. May I also point out however, that as an allotment virgin (first season!) we have had to bring a lot of stuff to the allotment to start to get it working. The ground is solid heavy clay and we have added lots and lots of bagged compost just to start it moving after a few years of lying fallow, unworked and largely waterlogged. It is still a major task. We have had to bring in nets and posts against pigeons, roof etc to repair the little old shed, an old plastic water butt from our tiny garden at home, and in the autumn we are looking to ship manure and grit to further help break up the soil. In years to come perhaps the compost we will make on site might be enough and it will look after itself more. This is by way of illustration of the fact that for all this we need the car, and if we are not going to clutter up the surrounding streets we need more than a mere six spaces for parking just outside the bottom of the field. Therefore any development of the brown field site between the allotment field and St Joseph’s Primary School needs to preserve and increase the spaces available for allotmenteers. Lack of parking will kill off the allotments in the end so this needs addressing if the council is to fulfil its statutory duties vis a vis allotments.

3. Please include the word ‘allotments’ in the definition of green infrastructure in Policy I4. para 4.6.31, else they will get ignored and eventually ridden roughshod over. If anything we need more of them not fewer. They are beneficial for getting people out of doors, caring for a patch of land to make it productive, and generally beginning to connect with what nature we have left round here. They learn new skills and make new friends. It is already known that a bit of exercise promotes not just physical health but also mental and emotional health, doctors are even prescribing exercise for this purpose. The production of food which is good for one is a great antidote to buying processed food with too much sugar, salt and fat in it. It indirectly promotes cooking as a skill which most of us need to learn or re-learn. Think how many boxes it ticks!

4. Plus the Aldershot Road allotments has school allotments on it for educational purposes, and I understand is a historic site, having had allotments on it since before WW1.

I am glad to be able to have a patch there.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/673  Respondent: 15227361 / David Garrod  Agent:
I strongly support policy A21 in retaining the Westborough Allotments as allotments. I also support POLICY I4 (Green and Blue Infrastructure) in its aim of enhancing biodiversity and believe that allotments need to be specifically included in the list of green spaces in the definition of "green and blue infrastructure" in para 4.6.31 of the draft plan (page 116).

As a mum of a 9 year old I have had an allotment on the Aldershot Road site for 4 years and for 4 years previously I helped another new mum with her plot on the same site.

I strongly believe that allotments help physical and mental health, encourage healthy outdoor activities for whole families, help people from all walks of life interact socially about a common love of gardening, encourage healthy eating, and combat obesity.

The allotment has provided a safe place for me to take my daughter as a baby to get exercise and fresh air while also providing food for the table. As my daughter has grown she has enjoyed helping on the plot, digging, planting and harvesting. It's helped with both our wellbeing and educated her about food and where it comes from.
We've also seen plenty of wild life in its natural habitat with slow worms nesting under slabs, mice in the shed and the odd brave fox. She also gets to interact with people from the older generation which gives her different and varied role models. It's a lovely oasis in an urban childhood. Even the bog toilet is an adventure.

We have adopted one of the old gentlemen as a surrogate grandad and he benefits by having a reason to visit us, to be included in our family and, get himself out and about rather than staying in and being lonely.

On our site in particular, we have a self help group WASHA which runs an educational program for children from a local school and novice gardeners. I benefited from this facility in the early years as one of the older gardeners provided invaluable mentoring. He gardens on a plot that was his dad's and which he helped on a boy so has been on the plot for 60 odd years.

Our site has been an allotment site since before the First World war. It is a site with historical value and I think it is a vital part part of the green infrastructure that enhances the landscape of Guildford. Furthermore allotments provide important recreational and health benefits for the residents of Guildford and need to be protected.

Retention of the lower vehicular access to the Aldershot Road allotments is crucial. I have one of the lower allotments and need that access point to load and unload equipment and harvests. The site is on a steep hill which makes vehicular access from the top very dangerous when the ground is wet.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/947  Respondent: 15254753 / Len Norman  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21

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

I support this policy retaining this land for Allotment use.

I have had an allotment on this site during the 1980’s and again for the last ten years. It is very near my home and has a truly beneficial effect on my physical and mental health.

After two hip replacements, shoulder surgery, and back pain I am unable to walk far but am quite able to attend my allotment to great effect. I have even entered this year’s allotment of the year which will tell you how successfully I can tend my plot. After retirement the practice of growing became my passion and I spend time every day on the plot at Aldershot Road.

If the building of houses went ahead and/or if the gate at the Aldershot Road end were to shut I would be unable to access the plot and would have to give up the practice which would affect my health undoubtedly.

I feel the fact that the local school children having a plot is most inspiring and do feel it is so important for children to know where food comes from and how it tastes. It seems unfair that housebuilding, business and greed could overshadow the benefits to the whole community here at Westborough.

Please think carefully before putting that greed first.

I understand the need for new housing but think retaining our green and cultivated spaces just as important. By the way I hope everyone concerned is aware of the bees on site at Aldershot Road and of their contribution to the balance of nature.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I am writing regarding Policy A21: Land at Westborough allotments, Guildford, part of the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

I support the policy to protect this open space and ensure it is in no way subject to any development.

In particular I would like to emphasise the importance that the lower vehicular access to the allotments, via Westway, is retained. The allotment site has a steep slope running from the Woodside Road entrance down to the West Way access point. This makes the Westway access point the only suitable entrance for the majority of tenants and any emergency services vehicles should an accident occur. A number of the allotment tenants are elderly and rely on this access to transport materials to their plot via car. If this access was altered there would be a real risk that medical attention would be severely delayed in an emergency and current and potential tenants would be put off keeping a plot.

I also believe the allotments should be included in the description of blue and green infrastructure under Policy I4. Allotments meet the needs of relaxation, exercise, recreation, visual amenity, wildlife habitat and agriculture just as much, if not more, than the parks, open spaces, private gardens, agricultural fields and woodland listed so should certainly be included. I have only had my plot since April but have already seen a great deal of wildlife at the site, including seeing a hedgehog just a couple of feet away, the first one I have seen living wild in my 36 years. I am already reasonably fit and healthy but in the four months I have had my plot I have been much more active and am eating a wider variety of fruits and vegetables. I live on Barrack Road and know a few of my neighbours, but there is not much of a community so it has been really nice to meet fellow plot holders at the allotments who share similar interests and feel part of a welcoming and supportive community.

I have been very impressed by the time many of the plot holders devote to supporting other tenants as well as running an educational programme for the neighbouring school. The current housing difficulties mean that many families cannot afford accommodation with access to their own outdoor space, therefore it is essential that spaces like allotments, where schools and families can actually interact with the land are retained. Looking at the site of the area next to the allotments where the proposed 38 homes are to be situated I would be surprised if there was room for a dedicated garden for each. The allotments will provide them with visually attractive surroundings and potentially an outdoor space if they were to apply for an allotment. The allotments are a very peaceful area and help to reduce traffic noise which is particularly welcome with the A3 being so close.

In summary the allotments should be recognised for contribution to the local infrastructure, both as a green space and as an essential part of the local community. The allotments have existed here since before the First World War and should not be affected by any type of development. They are a valuable resource and any alterations which do not preserve their current state would be a loss to future generations.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
This is to let you know that I support this policy of retaining this land for allotment use.

I was recently (about a month ago) allocated a plot on the Aldershot Road allotment site, after having been on the waiting list for a while. It really is a wonderful place. As soon as we walk through the gates, all the stresses of everyday life are forgotten. My whole family has gotten involved in the allotment, my husband doing a lot of the heavy digging required to get the plot ready to cultivate things and our two little boys (5 and 2 years old) “help” too, using their own little gardening tools and they love to pick raspberries and gooseberries (the only things other than weeds we inherited when taking over the plot). Having an allotment is a great opportunity to spend quality time together as a family outdoors, we have been spending a lot of time at weekends on the site since we got it, staying the whole day and bringing our own picnic lunch. Tristan, our older boy, has really enjoyed sowing vegetable seeds and planting seedlings the last few weekends and wants to go there every day to check if any new shoots have appeared! In the longer term I believe having an allotment will be a positive thing in terms of a more active lifestyle and spending more time outside and growing some of our own fruit and vegetables.

As I mentioned above, the Aldershot Road site really is a lovely place, set on a hill away from traffic noise. While we were on the waiting list for this site, we were offered a plot on a few other sites, none of which had the same look or feel. It is also a very friendly site. Since joining, we have been made to feel very welcome and everyone is very friendly, stopping for a chat, giving advice and encouragement. The site also runs a plot for a local school and helps novice gardeners with their plots.

I should also add that retaining the lower vehicular access is very important to the site as this is really the only safe access point for vehicles (needed for delivering things to the plots and, more importantly, for ambulance access in case of emergencies). I believe there may be some tentative plans for an alternative, whereby a new access point at the top of the site would replace the current main access. However, to do this I understand that a new road will be needed through the site, which would involve the loss of all the outer plots (including our own). For obvious reasons we are strongly opposed to this idea.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1676</th>
<th>Respondent: 15344609 / Bernard Etheridge</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the Aldershot Road Allotments I became aware of these allotments since early childhood in the 1940's, both my father and great uncle had plots on this site since early 1930's. The plot on which I currently work was taken over by myself in 1980 on the demise of my father, who won several "The Sturgess" cup for the best allotment in the "Stoke and District Allotment Society as it was in those days.

I believe that these allotments must be retained for the enjoyment of like gardeners both for recreation an maintaining good health, giving a healthy body and mind, by exercise and healthy eating fresh produce, not forgetting growing some floral decoration for the home, and friendships gained.

Having a double heart by-pass and valve replacement a short while ago the exercise and being out in the fresh air, considerably helped regaining my fitness over a period of some months. More recently I conracted Pneumonia and was hospitalised for 7-8 days in working the plot helped with my now full recovery, and at 80+ this was not an easy task.

Further regarding the lower access gates these are wholly necessary for ease of access,[ bearing in mind the access need for the local schools activities in being made aware of the relative need for growing food and where it comes from etc] deliveries of "fertiliser products" and other needs. The slope between the upper gate and the lower gate, whilst it
appears safe in the summer months, is totally different in the winter, since it becomes slippery and extremely dangerous, both on foot and vehicular.

When the area of ground, probably Plot was taken, early 1960's by Puttocks Garage, it was agreed a certain number of spaces were to be allocated to allotment holders in recognition of this, under the then new retaining wall. Prior to that, I well remember farmer 'Baldrey' having the area.

I was born in Hillcrest Road and lived until marriage in Guildford, I spent my early working life, in and around Wood Street [Drummond Bros] and nearby Normandy [Vokes Ltd], although now living in Fleet have a high interest in these allotments.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1865  Respondent: 15352417 / Bernard Parke  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21

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

I support this policy of retaining this land for allotment as such sites are not only in great demand but provides much needed recreation facilities within the Borough.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1930  Respondent: 15356289 / Hulatt Lewis  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21

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

Pleased to confirm that I approve the proposed retention of allotments in N Guildford.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2058  Respondent: 15360257 / May Fong  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21

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

I support this policy of retaining this land for Allotment use and make the strongest case possible from my own experience. I want to stress what I consider are the most important reasons for having allotments in general and our site in particular: 1) Having my allotment has affected me and my family in a very positive way 2) I strongly believe that the allotments help physical and mental health, encourage healthy outdoor activities for whole families, help people from all
walks of life interact socially about a common love of gardening, and encourage healthy eating.

3) For our site in particular, we have a self-help group WASHA which runs an educational program for local school children and novice gardeners.

4) Our site has been an allotment site since before the First World War. It is a site with historical value. I want to stress that allotments are a vital part of the green infrastructure that enhances the landscape of the city. Furthermore they provide important recreational and health benefits for the residents of Guildford and need to be protected at all costs. Additional allotments are particularly welcomed. In that respect I offer my strongest support for POLICY A21 (Westborough Allotments), and also my support of POLICY I4 (Green and Blue Infrastructure) in its aim of enhancing biodiversity. I shall also point out that "allotments" needs to be specifically included in the list of green spaces in the definition of "green and blue infrastructure" in paragraph 4.6.31 of the draft plan (page 116). Finally, I want to add that retention of the lower vehicular access is crucial to the viability of the site as allotments.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2303  Respondent: 15384545 / Maureen Biffen  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21

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

I agree with this policy to keep the land for allotment use only.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2935  Respondent: 15431073 / Roy Purves  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21

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

I support this policy of retaining this land for Allotment use. In particular I am concerned with the Allotment in Guildford named Aldershot Road where I have been a plotholder for almost forty years and which has given me so much important exercise together with so much fresh vegetables. This I am sure has been the experience of all people so involved in this pursuit and it would be such an awful loss to the community if any plans in hand meant that any allotments would be lost! Apart from the personal loss there is the matter of loss of the green infrastructure of the area which must be kept to a minimum at all costs. In mentioning my allotment above, it has a serious local problem which I feel needs to be given specific consideration. Following on the area surrounding our lower vehicular access changing from being a car park, it appears that this access in now in jeopardy and all our plotholders are very worried about the alternative plan which has been mooted. Any such change would involve people coming to the plot having a long uphill walk to the old higher gate and there is the additional problem for car users finding parking space. Any such change must have serious thought before implementing. I do hope that everyone agrees with me that all plans involving allotments must be looked at with great care because the implications are widespread indeed.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2987  Respondent: 15432993 / Hannah Moyvilan  Agent:
I support the policy for retention of allotment land at Aldershot site. This is very important for people with mental health issues, obesity, healthy living and encouragement children to take an interest in gardening. At Aldershot road site we have a school plot which got a gold medal in Guildford in bloom in 2015. There is a self-help group WASHA which helps families, elderly people and anyone who is struggling with their plot.

My grandchildren love going to the allotment to pick fruit and vegetables, also looking for wildlife, pond creatures, hedgehogs, slowworms and the green woodpecker. It is very important that we still have the lower vehicular access as it is quiet on dangerous walk around for children. I support Policy I4 (Green and Blue infrastructure) as it is enhancing biodiversity, allotment needs to be included in the list of green spaces in the definition of “green and blue infrastructure” in paragraph 4.6.31 of the draft plan (page 116).

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3107  Respondent: 15437825 / Graham Hoile  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21

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

I am supporting the retention of the land used for Allotment use.

The area is already saturated with housing, parking problems and traffic.

Building on this land will rob local residents of a worthwhile pastime and leisure activity, we will also loose the wildlife aspect as well.

The Broadacres and Oakfields is a nice area to live having lived here for 18 years like many residents.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4015  Respondent: 15468929 / Matt Shepstone  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21

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

Policy a21 - support

I would like to state my support of this policy of retaining the land for Allotment use.

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

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/4417  Respondent: 15483873 / Bridgette Shepstone  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21

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

I would like to state my support of this policy of retaining the land for Allotment use.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4627  Respondent: 15487905 / Claire Norman  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21

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

I wish to register my support for retaining the above allotment site.

My father and I both have plots on the site and since my father retired his allotment has been a lifeline for him, not only as a social, but also as a mental health benefit. If he did not have the allotment, his mental health would have suffered greatly. My grandfather also had a plot on the site, and my partner and I currently have a plot, so three generations of our family have had allotments on the Westborough site. This heritage is very important and this community-led site has been in existence since before the First World War.

The retention of the front access (behind St Josephs School) off Aldershot Road is also critical as there is no hardstanding for cars at the top of the site, and when it rained heavily recently, my partner and I parked on the grass which turned into a bog and we were stuck there for an hour trying to dig the car out.

The group WASHA work very hard and run an educational plot on the site for St Joseph’s School which I believe has won a prize. Creating an interest in gardening is critical for children of a young age as it teaches them about biodiversity, the importance of caring for the environment, and about healthy eating. I am a school counsellor and there are many school children suffering from obesity. In addition to changing to more healthy meals at school, it is educationally beneficial to teach children where food comes from and stimulate that interest at an early age about the environment. This teaching also links to School’s yearly Harvest Festivals which have a strong relationship to the allotments.

It is very sad that every few years we need to campaign for our cause, to save our allotments. This is a benefit for the community and we need to try and protect what little green spaces we have left from the threat of new builds. I therefore strongly believe that allotments should be included on the list of green spaces under ‘green and blue infrastructure’ under para 4.6.31 of the draft plan (p. 116) and I wholly support Policy I4 (Green and Blue Infrastructure).

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5376  Respondent: 15506145 / Dianne Mahan  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I most definitely support this policy to keep the allotment area as it is.

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

Attached documents:

I am writing regarding Policy A21 regarding Westborough Allotments. I would like to express my support that the allotment site is protected from development and the lower access to the site from Westway remains as it is.

Allotments provide an enormous benefit to the local community. They promote physical activity, healthy eating and provide a form of relaxation and stress relief to local residents. A number of the tenants are elderly and having an allotment encourages them to remain fitter and independent for longer. The allotments also support social interaction and allow people to become involved with their local community. The green and natural environment has also been proven to have a beneficial effect on health and wellbeing.

Westborough Allotments are particularly invested in the local community, having their own self-help group Westborough Allotments Self Help Association (WASHA), who run an education programme for the local school who won a Gold award in the 2015 Guildford in Bloom competition in the best allotment category. They also provide support to new and existing tenants to make the most of their plots.

The lower access to the plot, from Westway, is the only access point suitable for vehicles. There is other vehicular access but the allotment site slopes dramatically from this point so it would not be safe for a vehicle such as an ambulance to use. It is essential the lower vehicular access point is retained so in the event of an accident the emergency services can gain access the allotments. This access point is also regularly used by tenants transporting large or heavy materials to their plots, something which elderly tenants particularly rely on.

The allotments also provide vital green space for the local residents and wildlife. The noise and disruption that any development brings would have a detrimental effect on the area. Consideration should also be given to any neighbouring development to ensure there is as little disruption as possible. The local residents can live with and understand the disruption but the wildlife cannot and any nearby developments should be managed to have the minimum impact.

Further to this point I would suggest that allotments be specifically included in the list of green and blue spaces listed in Policy I4 in the Proposed Submission Local Plan. With the current rate of housing development it is essential that any sites which meet this definition are protected, particularly in areas like Guildford which are already built up. Allotments also provide a very unique environment which meet the needs of relaxation, exercise, recreation, visual amenity, wildlife habitat and agriculture in a way that other open spaces do not. They also provide a valuable tool with which to teach future generations the value of these open spaces.

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

Attached documents:
I support the policy of retaining this land for Allotment use. The half allotment that our family (with Rebecca aged 5 and Daniel aged nearly 3) shares with another family (with Kaitlyn aged 5 and Elena aged 2) provides us with food, exercise, intergenerational company and contact with nature (the children find the bee hives fascinating). Kaitlyn is very much looking forward to working on St Joseph's School plot soon. I find the allotment provides me with a bit of peace away from the family where I can unwind for an hour during schooltimes. One elderly allotment holder holds the same allotment that his father had before him - that soil is special! Our neighbour is aged 85 and we try to help each other with knowledge or muscle.

We have heard that lower vehicular access to Westborough allotments is under threat. My children cannot walk the distance from home to the other entrances. I would have to drive with them, which would add to traffic and defeat the point of getting them out exercising in the fresh air. I also sometimes have to drive onto the plot in order to deliver manure in quantity. The top entrance is not an option as the car would never make it up the hill (if it got down without incident).

The environment of the city would be a lot less green and happy without the allotments. More allotments would be good. I offer my strong support for POLICY A21 (Westborough Allotments) and support POLICY I4 (Green and Blue Infrastructure) in its aim of enhancing biodiversity. "Allotments" needs to be specifically included in the list of green spaces in the definition of "green and blue infrastructure" in para 4.6.31 of the draft plan (page 116).

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6909  Respondent: 15610337 / Pippa Scammell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A21

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

I write to support the need to preserve all the allotments that we have in Guildford. Allotments give people the opportunity to have recreational benefits without costing them a great deal. They are areas of peace and tranquility which allow people to relax and unwind after busy work days. My husband has had an allotment for just one year, but has seen already the benefit in helping him relax and be less stressed.

It is not only people who benefit by the existence of allotments, they are a haven to wildlife and oasis of green in the ever-increasing proliferation of housing needs. I would urge you to resist the temptation to build on allotment land for new housing however attractive that might be from a commercial point of view.

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

Attached documents:

Total records: 60.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A22 - Land north of Keens Lane, Guildford
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3398</th>
<th>Respondent: 8565089 / D Tucknott</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am writing to object to the proposed redevelopment plans north of Keens Lane for 140 new houses and the additional 14,000 new homes in and around Guildford.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The proposed area north of Keens Lane is Green Belt and should not be built on in accordance with Surrey County Councils guide lines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Exits to Keens Lane are via Worpslesdon Road or Aldershot Road currently with both junctions at a stand still during the rush hour.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Keens lane is not wide enough to carry additional traffic and cannot be widened because of Chittys Common at one end and existing housing the other end.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Additional housing and traffic etc would have detrimental effect on the wildlife and tranquillity of Chittys Common.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that it is the Councils plan to build 14,00 new homes in and around Guildford. The CURRENT infrastructure is insufficient to handle the existing level of housing yet alone more houses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The existing road system cannot cope with the current level of daily traffic in and around Guildford with so many “A” roads converging on the already inadequate Guildford Town centre one-way system It would take a new major ring road to overcome this problem. What plans are in place to support the additional traffic that any development will bring?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5649</th>
<th>Respondent: 8572257 / Mr Graham Bower-Wood</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUILDFORD NEW LOCAL PLAN 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY A22: Land north of Keens Lane Guildford – LAA reference: Site 126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to strongly object to the above proposal North of Keens Lane as a resident of Keens Park for the last 28 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firstly, this is Green Belt land, which I thought was protected from this type of development?.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The infrastructure and road system surrounding this area is highly unsuitable if this were to go ahead.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keens Lane itself is mainly a single lane road and would have to be upgraded from a leafy (one vehicle in most part) lane to a new two lane road completely destroying the hedgerow and many trees along it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I was under the impression that this site was part of a vital wildlife corridor between Whitmoor and Broadstreet Commons and these very important corridors are already of strong concern by the Government?.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/653  Respondent: 8584929 / Keith Stainer  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A22

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

Policy A22: Land to the North of Keens Lane

The proposal to increase the number of dwellings from 140 to 150 (Site Allocation A22) will add to the traffic congestions in this area. It will also increase the footfall on Whitmoor Common putting this SSI under even more strain. It is not uncommon for the existing parking areas on the edge of the common to be full, local people using the area for recreation such as dog walking frequently seem to prefer driving to the common rather than walking. I assume that in part this is because the roads abutting the common, namely the A322 and Salt Box Road have no provision for pedestrians to cross them and the flow of traffic on these roads is such that crossing on foot requires a fleetness of foot and mind that we do not all have.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3061  Respondent: 8585697 / Laurence Edwards  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22

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

Land north of Keens Lane – 140 homes and a care home with approximately 60 beds OBJECT as there is a current lack of infrastructure, including waste water infrastructure, to support development on this site. The narrow road cannot be widened due to the house called “Timbers” (of local heritage interest). Impact on the Grade II listed building called “Pitch Place House”. Proximity to Whitmoor Common SPA/SSSI. Bats, owls, moths. I object to the proposed relocation of the urban boundary at this point.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4069  Respondent: 8586977 / Ms Loraine Austin  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
The land off Keens Lane, Worplesdon (Site A22) in the GBC Draft Local Plan for the proposed development of 140 homes and a care home I believe is inappropriate for three main reasons:

1. The area is Green Belt, which should be retained and not built on. I am appending at the end of this email* the agreed Policy of Surrey County Council for your reference and urge that the green belt be protected by Guildford Borough Council.

2. Keens Lane is a narrow road (the word "lane" is a clue) and building more homes there would entail the widening of the road, but this does not account for the fact that at the far end, near to Gravetts Lane/Tangleys Lane, it is constricted and the area is already congested. Since the new housing has been built the traffic in the lane is uncontrolled and many cars speed along it. I have been in contact with Surrey County Council about this and asked that traffic calming measures be put in place but nothing has happened. I copy the email response I got below. There are often near collisions on the brow of the hill on the lane as traffic speeds faster and faster.

3. The proposed development site is close to Whitmoor Common and a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and would have a damaging effect on ecology and wildlife. It is also bounded by Broadstreet Common. The open nature of Worplesdon should be retained.

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

Attached documents:
they want to cut all the leylandi trees down that belong to my Close and border our garage block and their land. I’ve objected but am now anxious that they’ll push and push to get them down, they want to build 2/3 storey terraced cottages, taking yet more greenbelt land. It’s an outrage to the policy and I’m surprised GBC Planners are overlooking it. The leylandi trees I believe form a sound and pollution barrier to the A322 which is congested on a daily basis, SCC see fit to keep having road works on the stretch of road from the Seafare Fish and Chip shop down to the roundabout at Cumberland Avenue and Keens Lane making it even worse.

Keens Lane cannot take the addition of these 150 houses and a Care home – the additional traffic will create many problems for the already problematic traffic problem Guildford faces on a daily basis. You have referred to “Encourage cycling and pedestrian movements from the site” - this won’t happen in reality and with the 150 houses alone it will be bringing in the region of a further 300 cars to the lane, more with the visitors to the care home. I strongly oppose both the houses and the care home. The care home will bring potentially a further 60 cars from visitors and regular HGV vehicles for deliveries, ambulances, mini buses (ie Dial a Ride) coming back and forth for mobility (hospital visits for the residents). The lane isn’t suitable for this amount of additional traffic.

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

Attached documents:
Additionally it is too close to Whitmoor Common which is classified as an SPA & an SSSI.

WE OBJECT to the proposed relocation of the urban boundary which would result for from this proposed development

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4526  Respondent: 8627393 / Worplesdon Parish Council (Gaynor White)  Agent:

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

A22 Land north of Keens Lane – 140 homes and a care home with approximately 60 beds

OBJECT as there is a current lack of infrastructure, including waste water infrastructure, to support development on this site. The narrow road cannot be widened due to the house called “Timbers” (of local heritage interest). Impact on the Grade II listed building called “Pitch Place House”. Proximity to Whitmoor Common SPA/SSSI. Bats, owls, moths.

Worplesdon Parish Council objects to the proposed relocation of the urban boundary at this point.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4196  Respondent: 8627393 / Worplesdon Parish Council (Gaynor White)  Agent:

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

OBJECT as there is a current lack of infrastructure, including waste water infrastructure, to support development on this site. The narrow road cannot be widened due to the house called “Timbers” (of local heritage interest). Impact on the Grade II listed building called “Pitch Place House”. Proximity to Whitmoor Common SPA/SSSI. Bats, owls, moths.

Worplesdon Parish Council objects to the proposed relocation of the urban boundary at this point.

Increased traffic will correspondingly increase vehicular particulates and nitrous oxide emissions, which will have a detrimental impact on Whitmoor Common SPA/SSSI contrary to the Habitats Directive, the Birds Directive and the Habitats Regulations - See Judicial Review Case No: CO/3796/2013 (21.2.2014) Ashdown Forest Economic Development LLP Claimant - and - (1) Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (2) Wealden District Council (3) South Downs National Park Authority

This site provides an important wildlife corridor between Whitmoor Common SPA/SSSI/LNR and Chitty’s Common, Rydes Hill Common, Littlefield Common (SNCI) and Broad Street and Backside Commons (SNCI).
When assessing the suitability of this site constraints should be applied as per paragraph 119 of the NPPF.

Worplesdon Parish Council objects to the proposed relocation of the urban boundary at this point.

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

Attached documents:  

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2781  
Respondent: 8684833 / Adrian Hall  
Agent: 

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

I am writing to object to the proposal to retain, and increase, the number of houses to be built at Keen’s Lane. (Policy A22 Land to the North of Keens Lane)

Responses on previous submissions have been ignored and in fact the number of dwellings has been increased from 140 to 150.

- This will increase traffic congestion on the surrounding routes, which are already congested.
- It will add to traffic problems around exits on to Keens Lane, which is unsuitable for more than minor use by vehicles.
- It will put the protected area at Whitmoor Common under increased footfall pressure.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5715  
Respondent: 8706625 / Hilary Barker  
Agent: 

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

I OBJECT strongly to the development at KEENS LANE of 140 homes and a Care home.

This land is currently part of the Metropolitan Greenbelt

- Keens Lane is a narrow rural road – mostly single lane not suitable for extra cars generated by 140 new homes.
- This land is within the 400m buffer zone for the SPA, SSSI at Whitmoor Common.
- This land forms part of the wildlife corridor between Broad Street and Whitmoor Common.
- It will generate extra traffic exiting onto the A323 and A322 which are both at a standstill in rush hour traffic trying to get into Guildford.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1197  
Respondent: 8729313 / Lisa Wright  
Agent: 

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

This land is currently part of the Metropolitan Greenbelt

- Keens Lane is a narrow rural road – mostly single lane not suitable for extra cars generated by 140 new homes.
- This land is within the 400m buffer zone for the SPA, SSSI at Whitmoor Common.
- This land forms part of the wildlife corridor between Broad Street and Whitmoor Common.
- It will generate extra traffic exiting onto the A323 and A322 which are both at a standstill in rush hour traffic trying to get into Guildford.

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

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

OBJECT. Greenbelt site.

OBJECT. Close to historic building.

OBJECT, traffic implications for an already gridlocked area.

Keens Lane will have to be widened to accommodate the traffic.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4648  Respondent: 8734721 / M Bruder  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22

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

The Keens Lane development plans are inappropriate.

This is Green Belt area.

Vehicle volumes are already a problem and the infrastructure just cannot cope. A narrow road and even if work done at local junctions it just extends the problem to Rydeshill, Saltbox or other congested junctions.

The near vicinity of Whitmoor common means there will be an inevitable impact on wildlife, in particular as is a wildlife corridor between Whitmoor and Broadstreet Commons

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3202  Respondent: 8736385 / Anthony O.toole  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22

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

I am writing to object most strongly, to the above building proposal, it would make the biggest traffic jam every morning and evening, that guildford has ever seen, local services would not be able to Subtain the increase in extra population surge, and who are these houses for? Because local people would not be able to afford them, un less of course you can give them a 100 per cent, mortgage

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

Attached documents:
As a resident of Sime Close, I would comment on the summer 2016 local plan as follows:

**A22 Land north of Keens Lane, Guildford – homes (C3) and care home (C2)**

1. **Planning issues**

   1. The autumn 2013 issues and options document designated several areas (including plot A22) as poor for housing, yet the summer 2014 and 2016 local plans indicate plot A22 still for development. I do not understand this significant change in opinion and would seek proof from professionals that the areas are suitable for housing.

   1. The GBC leader has tweeted that the Strategic House Marketing Assessment (SHMA) should be revisited following Brexit. The number of housing units will then be reduced significantly from the current 690 and would negate the need to use Green Belt as housing.

   1. The site is currently categorised as Green Belt land, yet the local plan moves the boundary to exclude it from the Green Belt. I have a fundamental issue with GBC taking such improper action and not making this clear in the local plan. As such, no development should be carried out. It’s critical that Green Belt land is protected for both the survival of wildlife and human social and leisure use. The countryside is part of Britain’s heritage and it needs to be conserved. This version of the local plan appears to have been made without due consideration of these factors.

   1. Brownfield sites should always be considered for development ahead of Greenfield. This site is designated as Greenfield.

1. **Environmental and safety issues**

   1. The need to maintain the wildlife corridor between Whitmor and Broadstreet Commons as per the government guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF paras 113 & 117).

   1. Horses are ridden or led along the surrounding roads including Tangle Lane, Gravetts Lane and Keens Lane. The significant increase of travel in the area, introduced by the proposed development, will undoubtedly lead to fatalities.

   1. The site provides nesting habitat for deer and birds of all kinds from sparrows, robins, cuckoos to parrots, kestrels, heron, great-creased newts (protected species) and sparrow hawks.

   1. The loss of an area, including local flora and fauna, existing as a green lung separating Guildford and Worplesdon.

   1. There is a brook running parallel with the footpath that connects Keens Lane with Liddington Hall Drive and this attracts bats from the local area as a feeding area during the twilight hours of the spring, summer and autumn. All bats and their roosts are protected by law, therefore the Statutory Nature Conservation Organisation (SNCO) must be consulted if there is any threat to this protected species. This brook is in addition to a watercourse that runs on the east side of Gravetts Lane. Water voles are also present.

   1. There is a water feature on this plot which provides habitat for herons and other water birds.

   2. Deer and foxes have been seen crossing the site from east to west and vice versa, and should be considered in the possible use of the site.
1. Have the increased pollution levels been considered in light of the proposed building of c. 140 houses and care home i.e. approximately 350 additional cars?

1. **Infrastructure issues**

1. Parts of Tangley Lane, Keens Lane and Gravetts Lane are single track, and not suitable for the significant increase in traffic that would be created by circa 350 additional cars.

1. The main roads linking the above lanes i.e. the A320, A322 and A323 are already heavily congested in both the morning and evening rush hours. There will also be consequential adverse effects on the Guildford city traffic. Salt Box Road is also heavily congested linking the A320 and A322. This road is currently dangerous for cyclists and motorists due to poor visibility as a result of the poor width and numerous bends. This road is also very prone to ice during winter, making driving conditions hazardous. In addition, deer are present on both sides of this road. No doubt, there will be increased accidents and fatalities as a result of housing and care home development.

1. The current drainage systems over both sites cannot cope. e.g. Gravetts Lane with raw sewage evident on 23rd June 2016; Sime Close with frequent incidences of flooding at entrance, adversely impacting properties and access to the Close. These systems will cease to operate with the building of c. 140 houses and care home once fields are replaced with concrete.

1. The flood risk, although stated at zone 1 (low risk), will greatly increase with the proposed development of c.140 houses and a care home. What flood risk zone will this increase to, and is it appropriate for the existing residents of the local area?

1. There does not appear to be any provision of local amenities: shops, schools, parks, public transport and there will be an increasing burden on County Council, police and hospital services: has this been considered and additional resources to be available? The current resources are already restricted e.g. infrequent bus service and no stops near residences in Keens Lane/Sime Close etc. The street lighting is almost non-existent in Keens Lane, Gravett’s Lane and Tangley Lane. It currently takes at least 3 weeks to get a doctors’ appointment at Fairlands Surgery which is already an untenable situation without adding +300 patients to the area.

1. Why is another care home needed very close to the recently built care home on the A322? There is no provision for residents to walk to local shops and public transport is limited.

1. There is insufficient power in the area therefore gas and electricity systems would require upgrading.

1. The Broadband service in the area is very poor and not suitable for the number of residents in situ from the proposed development.

1. **Summary**

Plot A22 is Green Belt and should be preserved as such and therefore I would urge Guildford Borough Councillors to uphold its Green Belt status and not proceed with its planned development.

The draft local plan will also have a catastrophic effect on both residents and wildlife, nor are there adequate infrastructure needs to support the planned development of Plot A22. I conclude that the local plan is without merit and I strongly oppose its future progress.

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

**Attached documents:**
As a resident of Sime Close, I would comment on the summer 2017 local plan as follows:

**A22 Land north of Keens Lane, Guildford – homes and care home**

- The Broadband service in the area is very poor and not suitable for the number of residents in situ from the proposed development.
- Why is another care home needed very close to the recently built care home on the A322? There is no provision for residents to walk to local shops and public transport is limited.
- The flood risk, although stated at zone 1 (low risk), will greatly increase with the proposed development of c. 150 houses and a care home. What flood risk zone will this increase to, and is it appropriate for the existing residents of the local area?
- The current drainage systems over both sites cannot cope. e.g. Gravetts Lane with raw sewage evident on 23rd June 2016; Sime Close with frequent incidences of flooding at entrance, adversely impacting properties and access to the Close. These systems will cease to operate with the building of c. 150 houses and care home once fields are replaced with concrete.
- Parts of Tangleys Lane, Keens Lane and Gravetts Lane are single track, and not suitable for the significant increase in traffic that would be created by circa 350 additional cars.

**Infrastructure issues**

- Deer and foxes have been seen crossing the site from east to west and vice versa, and should be considered in the possible use of the site.
- There is a water feature on this plot which provides habitat for herons and other water birds.
- The loss of an area, including local flora and fauna, existing as a green lung separating Guildford and Worplesdon.
- The site provides nesting habitat for deer and birds of all kinds from sparrows, robins, cuckoos to parrots, kestrels, heron, great-creased newts (protected species) and sparrow hawks.
- The need to maintain the wildlife corridor between Whitmor and Broadstreet Commons as per the government guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF paras 113 & 117).

**Environmental and safety issues**

- The GBC leader has tweeted that the Strategic House Marketing Assessment (SHMA) should be revisited following Brexit. The number of housing units will then be reduced significantly from the current 690 and would negate the need to use Green Belt as housing.

**Planning issues**

- The autumn 2013 issues and options document designated several areas (including plot A22) as poor for housing, yet the summer 2014, 2016 and 2017 local plans indicate plot A22 still for development. I do not understand this significant change in opinion and would seek proof from professionals that the areas are suitable for housing.
- The site is currently categorised as Green Belt land, yet the local plan moves the boundary to exclude it from the Green Belt. I have a fundamental issue with GBC taking such improper action and not making this clear in the local plan. As such, no development should be carried out. It’s critical that Green Belt land is protected for both the survival of wildlife and human social and leisure use. The countryside is part of Britain’s heritage and it needs to be conserved. This version of the local plan appears to have been made without due consideration of these factors.
- Brownfield sites should always be considered for development ahead of Greenfield. This site is designated as Greenfield.
- Horses are ridden or led along the surrounding roads including Tangleys Lane, Gravetts Lane and Keens Lane. The significant increase of travel in the area, introduced by the proposed development, will undoubtedly lead to fatalities.
• There is a brook running parallel with the footpath that connects Keens Lane with Liddington Hall Drive and this attracts bats from the local area as a feeding area during the twilight hours of the spring, summer and autumn. All bats and their roosts are protected by law, therefore the Statutory Nature Conservation Organisation (SNCO) must be consulted if there is any threat to this protected species. This brook is in addition to a watercourse that runs on the east side of Gravetts Lane. Water voles are also present.
• Have the increased pollution levels been considered in light of the proposed building of c. 150 houses and care home i.e. approximately 350 additional cars?
• The main roads linking the above lanes i.e. the A320, A322 and A323 are already heavily congested in both the morning and evening rush hours. There will also be consequential adverse effects on the Guildford city traffic. Salt Box Road is also heavily congested linking the A320 and A322. This road is currently dangerous for cyclists and motorists due to poor visibility as a result of the poor width and numerous bends. This road is also very prone to ice during winter, making driving conditions hazardous. In addition, deer are present on both sides of this road. No doubt, there will be increased accidents and fatalities as a result of housing and care home development.
• There does not appear to be any provision of local amenities: shops, schools, parks, public transport and there will be an increasing burden on County Council, police and hospital services: has this been considered and additional resources to be available? The current resources are already restricted e.g. infrequent bus service and no stops near residences in Keens Lane/Sime Close etc. The street lighting is almost non-existent in Keens Lane, Gravett’s Lane and Tangley Lane. It currently takes at least 3 weeks to get a doctors’ appointment at Fairlands Surgery which is already an untenable situation without adding +300 patients to the area.
• There is insufficient power in the area therefore gas and electricity systems would require upgrading.

Summary

• Plot A22 is Green Belt and should be preserved as such and therefore I would urge Guildford Borough Councillors to uphold its Green Belt status and not proceed with its planned development.
• The draft local plan will also have a catastrophic effect on both residents and wildlife, nor are there adequate infrastructure needs to support the planned development of Plot A22. I conclude that the local plan is without merit and I strongly oppose its future progress.

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

Attached documents:
The Policy is not Sound in that a satisfactory explanation and clear reasoning and evidence is not shown as to how the Council has allocated Site A22 and its surrounds.

The selected site does not use all the land that is ready and available for housing.

Some 2 ha of land immediately to the north of the site and shown coloured green on the attached Plan (known as Tangley Place Farm south and bounded by Tangley Lane to the West and the boundary of the 400m SPA zone to the North) is fully available for housing purposes and shares exactly the same planning considerations as the allocated site A22.

The Council has submitted no clear reasoning and evidence why this site should be excluded for development. Indeed the published evidence base in the GBCS expressly indicates that the land is within a Projected Development Area (SITE J3).

Based on the Councils density guidelines some 80 new dwellings could be built here.

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

Attached documents:  tangle Place farm south.pdf (785 KB)

Policy site A22 : Keens Lane

The Amendment no 7 on the Plan appendix describes a change to this Policy as "incorrect GB boundary" I cannot see where any change is being made. The increase in the number of units is not justified in any way.

The incursion of the site into the 400m SPA zone is not justified and is dependent on further approval by Natural England. As such it cannot be relied on as an allocation at this stage.

This site remains poorly drawn and illogical and not reflective of the character of the Green Belt hereabouts.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Site A22

I strongly object to the inclusion of land off Keens Lane, Worplesdon (Site A22) in the GBC Draft Local Plan for the proposed development of 140 homes and a care home and believe this is inappropriate for three main reasons:

1. The area is Green Belt, which should be retained and not built on. Surrey County Council is historically the creator of the Green Belt and has previously agreed to:

   To use its power to protect Surrey's Green Belt.

   i. To support the National Planning Policy Framework (section 9 - paragraphs 79 to 92) and the Government's policy of protecting the Green Belt.

   ii. To make Surrey's MPs and the County's Districts and Boroughs aware of this resolution.

   iii. That any Green Belt development in the County is in line with the needs and wishes of Surrey residents

   ON THIS POINT ALONE THIS DEVELOPMENT MUST NOT BE INCLUDED IN THE PLAN AND ANY DEVELOPMENT APPROVED.

   1. Keens Lane is a narrow lane and building more homes leading onto the already over busy Worplesdon Road and Aldershot Road via Gravets I. Parts of these lanes are little more than single track and used widely by walkers and horse riders. To increase traffic levels will potentially endanger human life.

   1. The proposed development site is close to Whitmoor Common and a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and would have a damaging effect on ecology and it is also bounded by Broadstreet Common. The open nature of Worplesdon should be retained. The land is part of the important wildlife corridor between Whitmoor and Broadstreet Commons. As such, developing the site would conflict with NPPF paras 113, 117, 118, and 119.

Historical previous applications in the area have been turned down by the inspectorate for the following reasons:

The proposed development, in my opinion, would further impair the efficiency of both the A323 and A322 which, as principal roads connecting Guildford to the M3 and the major growth area, must be safeguarded...

In 1983, the County Engineer wrote to the then MP concerning the Surrey Structure Plan: "Accordingly the County Council as Highway Authority will seek to prevent the grant of any planning permission which would significantly increase traffic to the south of Liddington Hall". In 1985, in spite of the above, an attempt was made by the County Council to build on Liddington Hall Farm, which at that time they owned. The Inspector recommended: "In my judgement, the discharge to A322/A323 of traffic from 700 dwellings additional to that arising from expected development at Tilehouse, Stoughton and from general growth of traffic would add unacceptably to prevailing congestion and danger on the main framework roads."

In 2003, the Officer Report to the Executive on the Deposit Draft Surrey Structure Plan 2002 stated:

The findings thusfar suggest that the transport impacts associated with the north west community [the Liddington Hall site] would be significant and difficult to resolve.

The traffic on our local roads has increased significantly over the past few years making these comments in my opinion even more relevant.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2690  Respondent: 8810017 / Alison White  Agent:
Policy A22: Land north of Keens Lane, Guildford - OBJECT
I object most strongly to the increase of housing provision for this site in the revised 2017 Local Plan. The site is totally unsuitable for this type of development anyway and any increase in housing numbers will just compound the problems. The adverse factors are so strong that I find it amazing the site is being put forward for an increase of any size. Some of them are listed below:

a) It is good Green Belt. The reason given for dropping the neighbouring Liddington Hall site is because of the "high sensitivity Green Belt". The same should apply to the Keens Lane site.

b) It is part of the important wildlife corridor between Whitmoor and Broadstreet Commons. As such, developing the site would conflict with NPPF paras 113, 117, 118, and 119.

c) It is very close to the SPA of Whitmoor Common and the damage to the Common from the development could not be gainsaid (see the comment on Policy 5). None of the SANGs that have been suggested would offer anything like an alternative.

d) It would add to the chronic traffic congestion in the sector. Traffic is a major factor that has been cited in the rulings in the rejection of three previous proposed developments in this immediate area:

In 1976, the inspector recommended: "The proposed development, in my opinion, would further impair the efficiency of both the A323 and A322 which, as principal roads connecting Guildford to the M3 and the major growth area, must be safeguarded ...".

In 1983, the County Engineer wrote to the then MP concerning the Surrey Structure Plan: "Accordingly the County Council as Highway Authority will seek to prevent the grant of any planning permission which would significantly increase traffic to the south of Liddington Hall". In 1985, in spite of the above, an attempt was made by the County Council to build on Liddington Hall Farm, which at that time they owned. The Inspector recommended: "In my judgement, the discharge to A322/A323 of traffic from 700 dwellings additional to that arising from expected development at Tilehouse, Stoughton and from general growth of traffic would add unacceptably to prevailing congestion and danger on the main framework roads."

In 2003, the Officer Report to the Executive on the Deposit Draft Surrey Structure Plan 2002 stated: "The findings thus far suggest that the transport impacts associated with the north west community the Liddington Hall site] would be significant and difficult to resolve."

The only thing that has changed is that the traffic levels have increased hugely. These previous rulings are vital and cannot be ignored.

e) Keens Lane & Tangley Lane are too narrow largely for two cars to pass each other, mostly without pavement, partly with high banks & are used widely by horse riders and walkers and the increase in traffic generated by the development (or any development here) presents a hazard.

f) Both the land and lanes are often flooded in winter months due to a high water table. Further development will exacerbate this problem. All in all this development should not be allowed to go ahead.

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

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

Site 61 Keens Lane. 140 houses and a care home.

By your own admission part of this land falls within 400m of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and partly within 400m – 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. Therefore as this land is so close to Whitmoor Common its development should not be countenanced.

The roads adjoining this site, Keens Lane, Tangle Lane and Gravetts Lane, are very narrow rural lanes with only the width for a single car in places. Therefore again this site should immediately be dismissed from consideration.

It almost goes without saying that this is also Green Belt land for which exceptional circumstances must be shown to permit development.

The site forms part of a vital wildlife corridor linking Whitmoor Common, SPA and SSSI, with the Hogs Back, AONB, via Chitty’s Common, Rydes Hill Common, Littlefield Common (SNCI), Broad Street and Backside Commons (SNCI).

Water voles (a protected species) have been recorded on Pitch Place Green, which abuts the site. I understand the Great Crested Newts have also been found on the land.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5937  Respondent: 8827841 / Christine David  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Specifically, the Keens Lane site nominated for development has major disadvantages in terms of being –

o on Green Belt land

o in close proximity to the Special Protection Area of Whitmoor Common and its wildlife corridor with Broadstreet Common

o already a congested area during morning and evening rush-hours, where any additional traffic can only result in gridlock.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1702  Respondent: 8828417 / Valerie Wild  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Site Allocations
SUPPORT. The OMISSION of Liddington Hall and Fairlands from the plan is CORRECT, for many reasons, including those given below for the neighbouring Keens Lane site.

Site A22- Land to the north of Keens Lane

OBJECT.

1. It is in the Green
2. Keens Lane is in close contact with the Whitmoor Common SPA and forms part of an integral wildlife corridor to the Broad Street Common SSSI and to the Hogs Back AONB and to the countryside beyond and as such provides a green ribbon to prevent a corralling in of the local wild I can see no satisfactory way to provide alternative land which would be of use to wildlife to compensate for blocking the corridor.
3. Traffic from the Keens Lane site would expect to be able to access the A322 from Tangle Lane. However, there is a continuous flow of traffic from the A322 towards the A323 using Gravetts Lane as a rat run on a daily basis. Traffic is a daily problem in Guildford and is particularly bad on the Aldershot Road (A323). The traffic queues back beyond Fairlands Village each morning and there are four particular bottlenecks before the Dennis roundabout: firstly the roundabout at Holly Lane on the A323 which is signed as a route from the A3 through Jacobs Well to the A323 and the Western route into Guildford; secondly the mini roundabout at Rydes Hill where the road from Wood Street joins the Aldershot Road and is used by motorists as a rat run to avoid the queues at Fairlands and which takes precedence over Aldershot Road traffic at that point; thirdly the meeting with the Worplesdon Road (A322); and fourthly the Dennis roundabout itself. A Park and Ride could provide some amelioration, but it would need to be well back from Fairlands towards Normandy so as not to exacerbate the daily problems experienced. It would need to be in place before any extra housing is considered. Furthermore, it is my understanding is that your preference is for any Park and Ride in the area to be on the A322, which is more of an arterial road.

Surely you can agree that Keens Lane should be taken out of the Local Plan for any kind of development.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1276  Respondent: 8828417 / Valerie Wild  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A22

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

Policy A22: Land north of Keens Lane, Guildford – OBJECT

I object to the increase of housing for this site in the revised 2017 Local Plan and which was considered unsuitable on previous occasions and an increase in numbers will only exacerbate the problems which we, as local residents, already suffer from.

Traffic on the A323 and the A322 is already in a state of stationary congestion on these two major routes which provide access to the centre of Guildford, to the A3, to the A31, access towards The Royal Surrey County Hospital, the University of Surrey, The Science Park and the Guildford Business Park where the A323 joins the access roads on and off the A3. Keens Lane and Tangle Lane traffic from any new development will pass directly onto the A322 or will join Gravetts Lane at the three-way junction and join the A323. There is no other way for the traffic to leave the site.

Both Tangle Lane and Keens Lane are so narrow that it is impossible for two cars to pass without one car becoming stationary. Combine this with a Z bend and no pavements on Tangle Lane and with both lanes being sunken with high hedges and blind bends then extra traffic will be a serious health and safety issue for pedestrians which will be impossible to ameliorate.
Any increase in housing is untenable – in my opinion, as a resident of over 40 years who continually has to use these lanes, then the fewer houses the safer the local residents will be.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6316  Respondent: 8835265 / Avi Baidya  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Please accept this email as my FORMAL letter of objection to the local plan development of housing to the immediate area surrounding Keens Lane in N.W. Guildford, i.e., the inclusion of land off Keens Lane, Worplesdon (Site A22) in the GBC Draft Local Plan for the proposed development of 140 homes and a care home.

The reasons for this objection are ostensibly the same as we have given back to your Council government in many many previous consultations over the last ten years.

In fact, your continued ignorance to address the core issues facing this area of Guildford is incomprehensible. Specifically, all draft plans submitted for new housing development in this region for the last 10 years DO NOT address the fact that the current road & public transport infrastructure can not support any additional vehicular traffic. And yet, for the last 10 years we have continued to pay our increasing council tax fees, and have submitted countless representations to your local government.

How do you justify maintaining a salary based on such a lack of representation of the feedback provided by your residents?

In addition, as you well know, this area is DESIGNATED Green Belt, which should be retained.

Keens Lane is a narrow road and building more homes there, would require the road to be widened, would increase the number of cars and yet this road is already congested. Also, during times of heavy rain Keens Lane is regularly flooded.

The proposed development site is close to Whitmoor Common and a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and would have a damaging effect on ecology and wildlife. It is also bounded by Broadstreet Common.

Worplesdon, Wood Street & Fairlands should be retained as a separate villages and should not merge into GUILDFORD town centre.

In my opinion, until the issues of more public transportation, more north & southbound access to the A3, the persistent congestion/blocking of the Ladymead bypass & the bottleneck caused by all roads leading to Dennis roundabout is addressed, NO FURTHER HOUSING DEVELOPMENT should be considered for this area of n.w. Guildford.

I respectfully request that as our elected representatives, and in the spirit of cooperation, that you reverse the behaviour displayed during the last ten years of ignoring our requests on such core issues.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/991  Respondent: 8848033 / Paul Gerrard  Agent:
I object to C3 housing on this site. It is within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, with some of the site within 400m, and therefore any development is subject to EU/UK legislation (NPPF 119). The impact of development cannot be mitigated with SANGs because at present there is no evidence base to support SANGs as required by NRM6 viii, NPPF 158 and 166.

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

### Comment ID: pslp172/3208  **Respondent:** 8852321 / David Hart  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A22

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

With regard to the small changes made on page 190 to the proposals for development of the land north of Keens Lane, I welcome the commitment to involve Natural England in ensuring that the SPA is not adversely affected, but the proposed increase in the number of homes will further exacerbate the problems of inadequate local infrastructure and obstruction to the wildlife corridor.

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

### Comment ID: PSLPS16/6271  **Respondent:** 8852449 / Bill Bagnall  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22

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

I object to the development proposed for site A22 (land at Keens Lane, Worplesdon) in the GBC Draft Local Plan. The proposed development of 140 homes and a care home is inappropriate for five main reasons:

1. The area is designated Green Belt. It should not be built on and I should refer you to the agreed Policy of Surrey County Council. GBC should actively protect the green belt.

2. Keens Lane is a very narrow lane. At points, it is not possible for cars to pass without one pulling to the side. This area does not cope adequately with existing traffic.

3. The proposed A22 site is close to Whitmoor Common which is a Site of Special Scientific Interest. The proposed development would increase the damage to the wildlife and and the flora. The development would reduce the open nature of Worplesdon and inhibit the transit of wildlife across the commons in the area.

4. There is an absence of infrastructure in the area, which would militate against the placement of further dwellings. Existing local facilities are already oversubscribed.

   1. The local major roads, the A322 and the A323 would receive the extra traffic from this development. They are already overburdened at rush hour.
Pleasenote also...

1. I object to the Draft Local Plan in respect of the SHMA of 693 houses per annum. The GBC assessment is untrustworthy to the point where the Council is not able to share the basis for the calculation, hiding behind the flimsy defence of contractual issues.

1. I object to the absence of a published coherent survey of traffic in and around Guildford and the lack of a programme to rectify the inadequacies of the existing roads.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/369  Respondent: 8854945 / Amanda Evans  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A22

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

Policy A22: Land north of Keens Lane, Guildford

I object to the increase of housing provision for this site in the revised 2017 Local Plan.

Keens Lane is too narrow in much of its length for two cars to pass each other, and the increase in traffic generated by the development (or any development here) presents a hazard. The only way to make the lane safe would be to destroy the hedgerows and widen the road. This would not only have a negative effect on the natural environment but would also provide greater temptation for drivers to use excessive speed along this road.

Any increase in traffic along Gravetts Lane and Tangley Lane is hazardous, given their narrow width, high banks and hedgerows, and an acute blind corner. Attempts to make the road wider would cause problems similar to Keens Lane.

Any increase in housing would have a negative impact on the quality of life of the current residents.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1123  Respondent: 8855201 / Catherine Harding  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22

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

This proposed development is within 400m of the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection Area. The species it was set up to preserve are designated as vulnerable due to the pressures of development. Therefore there should be no further development in the area.

The road is narrow and already under considerable pressure at school run and rush hours. Local people will suffer additional loss of amenity loss of amenity, noise and disturbance.
This is an inappropriate use of land in the greenbelt, Stingers Common, the locally designated SNCI as development will have a adverse effect on the biodiversity of the area.

It is too close to listed buildings.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/108  **Respondent:** 8855681 / Hannah Croke  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A22

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

I have previously submitted objections to the draft Local Plan which threatened to destroy decent green belt land in Worplesdon. I am delighted that the Liddington Hall site was removed from the Local Plan, however am dismayed and vehemently object to the revision concerning the Keens Lane site (Policy A22 Land north of Keens Lane Guildford), which has suffered an increase in the number of homes to 150, which will only worsen the impact on the area.

**Traffic and congestion.** In the Key facts about the Borough on page 15, para 2.14a of the June 2017 draft Local Plan, it is well documented that the A3 is congested at peak times, and anyone travelling on the A322 and A323 at peak times will know that this congestion has a significant knock-on effect on these 2 main roads in and out of Guildford from Aldershot and Bagshot. The proposed increase in development (which in itself is objectionable) ignores the fact that Keens Lane itself is a single road, leading to Tangleley Road (also a single road with no footpaths and blind bends) and Gravetts Lane, also a single road. These are residential roads which are already at capacity with on street parking causing additional congestion at peak times. To add to the number of cars using these roads, both as residential access and as rat runs between the A322 and A323, will cause disruption and will be hazardous to existing users. During the morning peak time Keens Lane and Gravetts Lane is full of school children who cycle and scoot to the local school along the single footpath. Additional vehicles will lead to cars queuing on these roads and adding to the misery of commuting into Guildford. This is not to mention the detrimental impact of construction vehicles during development which will seriously disrupt the semi-rural nature of the area which is.

**Green belt land.** The land is in the green belt and should not be built upon when there are brownfield sites which remain undeveloped.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3422  **Respondent:** 8859009 / Sonia MacLean  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22

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

I strongly object to this site being developed on the grounds of:
1) Land is protected Green Belt
2) Increased traffic congestion which poses risk of more accidents in an area where existing infrastructure can barely cope
3) Risk to welfare of wildlife habitat.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5897</th>
<th>Respondent: 8878689 / E McShee</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy A22 (Page 171) – Land North of Keens Lane, Guildford.

I object to the use of this land for 140 homes and a Care Home. Keens Lane is a very narrow road that leads to the Worplesdon Road, which is a very busy and at times congested road. There are already several Care Homes in this locality – Worplesdon View is adjacent to this site, Queen Elizabeth Park Care Home is sited on the Queen Elizabeth Park housing estate, Claremont Court Care Home is in Harts Gardens and Primrose House is further along the Worplesdon Road near Perry Hill.

This area of land is also close to Whitmoor Common Thames Basin Heaths SPA, it is also adjacent to a listed building on Pitch Place Green.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4892</th>
<th>Respondent: 8890753 / Jan Messinger</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to Policy A22 land north of Keens lane being built on. This road is very narrow with a house called the Timbers which actually is in the road so the road could not be widened. This area is full of wildlife and Grade II listed buildings. This would be detrimental to the area.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2237</th>
<th>Respondent: 8893697 / Gill Woolfson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objection to Policy A22 Land North of Keen's Lane
Parts of this site are within the 400m zone of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA (SPA). I have no objection to the care home, but have concerns over damage to the SPA from the rest of the development, 140 houses.

Whilst there is a covenant banning pets for the care home, there is not one for the housing. If cats are not banned there is a risk to the SPA. GBC state that only the most immobile will use these homes, such that they are unlikely to access the SPA for recreation. How can this be controlled? Will mobile C2 potential occupants be turned away? And what would the criteria for rejection be? If the occupants have dogs, there is a severe risk of harm to the SPA. NPPF 113 and 117 point 3 refers

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7022  Respondent: 8922689 / C Poole  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22

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

I object to all the proposed development at Keens Lane. This area is Green Belt. Keens Lane is already dangerous for all road users - pedestrians, cars, bicycles, horses - as a single lane road already used as a cut through for other traffic. It also forms part of an important wildlife corridor between Whitmoor and Broadstreet Commons. Excess water run off from Keens Lane causes flooding in Sime Close and Gravetts Lane which would be made much worse by removing green space.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3376  Respondent: 8937953 / Ralph & June Dalton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22

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

I have noted activity in the field opposite our house in Tangley Lane, notably a survey team, which leads me to believe that development plans are being drawn up.

I will object to any development of this area as it is a haven for wildlife, this year we have deer, various nesting birds and Bats roosting and using this field. It is very close Whitmoor comon and Chitty’s so that would result in an impact on the wildlife there.

Also Keens Lane and Tangley Lane are very narrow and could not support any additional traffic or exits/entrances without severe disruption in the area.

At the moment the night sky is dark enough for observation of stars, however any new lighting schemes would impact on this light level severely.

I understand that this area is still under Green Belt protection so any large scale development would be prohibited.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
We originally opposed the Keens lane development as it would be harmful to the occupants and the wildlife in this local area. We are now astounded to see that you have increased the number of houses in the plan here. Any development on this land would be extremely harmful and will cause issues such as the below:

- Loss of habitat for the Deer, Bats, birds of prey and other wildlife in these fields and surrounds.
- Traffic congestion and increased danger to people and horses from the extra entrances and exits to Keens Lane / Tangle Lane
- Increase in people using Whitmoor Common, which will put this protected area under more strain.
- Increased likelihood of bad flooding in Tangle Lane due to water run-off from the development in these fields.
- Noise and Light pollution will also increase.

We would like to re-register our objection based on the change to the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I wish to object to the inclusion of the land off Keens Lane Worplesdon (Site A22) into the Local Plan for development for the following reasons,

1. The Road infrastructure of the feeder roads is totally unsuitable for any increase.
2. The site is in the Green Belt and should remain there.
3. Any resultant traffic increase is just not acceptable and cannot be justified.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/803  
**Respondent:** 8957441 / Hazel Cleasson  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22

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

**Keens Lane site** - I object to this site being considered as a suitable site for 140 dwellings and/or 60 bed residential care home as it falls within the Metropolitan Greenbelt; part of the site falls within the 400m buffer zone of Whitmoor Common SPA and SSSI. (A Common where the new residents are more likely to visit than the proposed Russell Place Farm SANG some 5km away.) It is a vital wild life corridor and is also home to water voles (a protected species). Vehicle emissions from this site would have a detrimental impact on Whitmoor Common. Keens Lane is a very narrow single width country lane as is Tangle and Gravetts Lane. Keens Lane would be especially difficult, if not impossible, to widen as it is bordered by Chitty’s Common - which is registered common land. Any access into the A322 Worplesdon Road would be potentially dangerous and would exacerbate the existing traffic problem. There is also an issue with flooding.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/82  
**Respondent:** 8957441 / Hazel Cleasson  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A22

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

**Land North of Keens Lane Policy A2 site 126.**

I OBJECT - 140 was to many and unrealistic, to increase by 10 is madness. Access is down a country lane barely wide enough for single traffic let alone two way. It is a main wildlife corridor between Broad Street, Rydes Hill, Chitty’s and Whitmoor commons. Both the A322 and A323 have rush hour issues and already at capacity whether from commuting public or delivery vehicles of all types. These 2 roads bottleneck at Woodbridge Hill; when severe rain, there are flooding issues especially on the A323.

Whilst it might be possible to restrict any pets kept by residents in a care home, it will be impossible to do the same for private residential properties, regardless of the age of the occupants. To suggest no staff accommodation will be permitted within 400m of the SPA is totally bizarre - does that mean that if they are already local they will have to move
or not be allowed to buy/build/rent one of these residential properties if not local. Really does need some joined up thinking and clarity.

Like the idea of encouraging cycling and pedestrian momentum to and from site. However if the "Strategic SANG" that allowed this development to come into being is a car drive away - Russell Place Farm Frog Grove Lane Wood Street for example - can't see many dog walkers either able or willing to walk/cycle along the Aldershot Road with dog/s trotting along side. As new locals they will seek the nearest open space such as Rydes Hill, Chitty's Broad Street or even Whitmoor Commons. If they are going somewhere special yes they will drive but not just to exercise either themselves or their pets.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6674  Respondent: 8974177 / Nigel Mitchell  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22

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

Object

This site has been taken out of the Green Belt by the moving of the urban boundary to enclose it, which no doubt is excluded from the percentage of green belt used for the development.

The site is within a rural setting with the road infrastructure a serious concern. At the western end of Keens Lane the road is 4.4m wide from the kerb outside Sydney Court to the south and Timbers to the north. Timbers is a 16th Century building which has been maintained to a high standard by the current owners. Therefore widening the road to increase the traffic capacity is not an option. The roundabout to the eastern end of Keens Lane is treated as a chicane by the vehicle entering it from both the north and south and is therefore dangerous.

The sewer system in the area is at capacity. Indeed during the recent storms on 23rd June the manholes in Gravetts Lane were overspilling and bubbling up onto the road.

Rainwater run off carrying silt and other debris from Keens Lane and Findlay Drive drains into a soakaway drain in Sime Close. This drain is now full of silt and constantly fails to drain away leaving a large volume of water across the road. Further hardstanding within a development to the north of Keens Lane will make this problem worse.

There is insufficient electricity provision within the area as experienced by the number of power outages during the winter.

Worplesdon Road is already one of the worst roads in the borough for traffic congestion and an additional 140 homes and a care home would add to this congestion.

The site is close to Whitmoor Common and as such would be protected by the constraints associated with the SPA but these appear to have been ignored.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6675  Respondent: 8974177 / Nigel Mitchell  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22
Object

This site has been taken out of the Green Belt by the moving of the urban boundary to enclose it, which no doubt is excluded from the percentage of green belt used for the development.

The site is within a rural setting with the road infrastructure a serious concern. At the western end of Keens Lane the road is 4.4m wide from the kerb outside Sydney Court to the south and Timbers to the north. Timbers is a 16th Century building which has been maintained to a high standard by the current owners. Therefore widening the road to increase the traffic capacity is not an option. The roundabout to the eastern end of Keens Lane is treated as a chicane by the vehicle entering it from both the north and south and is therefore dangerous.

The sewer system in the area is at capacity. Indeed during the recent storms on 23rd June the manholes in Gravetts Lane were overspilling and bubbling up onto the road.

Rainwater run off carrying silt and other debris from Keens Lane and Findlay Drive drains into a soakaway drain in Sime Close. This drain is now full of silt and constantly fails to drain away leaving a large volume of water across the road. Further hardstanding within a development to the north of Keens Lane will make this problem worse.

There is insufficient electricity provision within the area as experienced by the number of power outages during the winter.

Worplesdon Road is already one of the worst roads in the borough for traffic congestion and an additional 140 homes and a care home would add to this congestion.

The site is close to Whitmoor Common and as such would be protected by the constraints associated with the SPA but these appear to have been ignored.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7967  Respondent: 8977025 / Sustainable Land PLC  Agent: Roger Daniels

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22

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

This report presents the detailed representations of Sustainable Land on Policies P2 and S2 of Guildford Borough’s Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (June 2016). It is accompanied by a preliminary Landscape and Visual Appraisal, Appendices on Housing Targets and Green Belt Review, and completed consultation questionnaires for Policies P2 and S2.

This report and its appendices reveal a failure of the draft Local Plan to meet the full objectively-assessed need for housing, over the whole of the plan period, and a failure to achieve a five-year supply of housing land on adoption of the Local Plan. Policies P2 and S2 are not sound because the Spatial Strategy and Green Belt policy do not achieve the delivery of housing in accordance with objectively assessed housing needs throughout the plan period.

To make the plan sound will require the release of additional sites for housing development that can be made available in the early years of the plan. The most sustainable options will include small and medium-sized sites that are closely related to the main urban areas and other significant settlements where they can make use of existing infrastructure, such as schools and other services.
This report demonstrates the suitability for release from the Green Belt and allocation for housing development of an area of land north of Keens Land and Gravetts Land and south of Worplesdon Road to contribute to meeting housing requirements in a sustainable location without significant harm to Green Belt or landscape considerations. It analyses opportunities and constraints and presents an indicative development framework that responds to these opportunities and constraints.


2. In its previous responses, Sustainable Land commented on the Council’s approaches to the objective assessment of housing needs and Green Belt review, and identified a sustainable, potential location for the development of housing and other uses north west of Guildford, based on extending an area of land identified by the Council as Parcel J3, south of Worplesdon Road, westwards across Tangle Lane: to create a new, long-term, defensible Green Belt boundary along the course of the brook that runs south-west from Whitmoor Common, with the Golf Course further to the west providing a clear gap with Fairlands.

3. This report responds to the Regulation 19 Consultation on the Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites published in June 2016 and its evidence base, including the Green Belt & Countryside Study (GBCS), the West Surrey Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) of October 2015 and the Land Availability Assessment (LAA) of February 2016, which are the subjects of appendices to this report.

4. This submission does not challenge the findings of the SHMA, but questions whether the Council has positively sought opportunities to meet the development needs of their area; whether the local plan meets objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change; and whether the plan takes account of unmet needs from neighbouring authorities through the ‘Duty to Co-operate’.

5. In particular, this submission challenges the ability of the Local Plan to meet objectively assessed housing needs throughout the plan period, in the light of information contained in the LAA and the Council’s approach to phasing in Local Plan Policy P2.

6. It is admitted in paragraph 4.1.9 of the Local Plan that the spatial development strategy contained in this policy inhibits the delivery of housing in the early years of the plan, with a phasing policy that defers housing supply and is not justified by the SHMA analysis of housing requirements. There are also questions about whether the Local Plan has responded to the ‘Duty to Co-operate’ by considering shortcomings in the spatial development strategy are due to failings in the GBCS which are reflected in Local Plan Policy S3. The GBCS dismissed a number of sustainable locations for development within the Green Belt that associated with the main urban areas and other settlements, including the area of land at Worplesdon that is the subject of this report, part of which was identified earlier in the GBCS as a Potential Development Area (PDA).

7. There have been a number of changes in site allocations proposed in the Local Plan, since the previous Regulation 19 consultation of July 2014, which are not explained.

8. The previous Local Plan consultation proposed the allocation of a 27 ha site at Liddington Hall (south of Keens Lane/Gravetts Lane and north of A323 Aldershot Road) for housing and a traveller site. This location, identified as Site 62, had previously been identified as a Potential Development Area in the GBCS (Land Parcel J1). It is no longer proposed to be allocated and is shown as remaining in the Green Belt.

9. Land south of Worplesdon Road and west of Tangley Lane (Site 102) was previously proposed for use as a crematorium, whilst still being ‘washed-over’ by Green Belt. The framework plan for development at Tangley Place Farm, proposed by Sustainable Land in their previous representations, was consistent with that proposal; unifying the use with open space, including a SANG and landscaping, to the south of the proposed crematorium.

10. A crematorium is no longer proposed at Worplesdon Road/Tangley Lane in the current consultation and another site at Salt Box Lane has been identified for a ‘burial ground’. The new location (Site A23) is in a corner of the Whitmoor Common, with the SPA on two sides. The proposed burial ground will require a Habitat Regulations Assessment and special, unspecified measures to control access and car parking at the burial ground in order to limit additional recreational pressures on the SPA.

11. The framework plan for land at Tangley Place Farm proposed by Sustainable Land does not depend on the proposal for a crematorium or burial ground to the north of the site, although the proposed open space, including SANG and landscaping, would have made it a more successful solution than the site at Salt Box Lane within the SPA.

12. The proposed allocation north of Keens Lane (formerly Site 61), to the south of Tangley Place Farm, has been retained as an allocation in the Local Plan for about 140 homes and a care home (Site A22).
13. The context for development proposals at Tangle Place Farm, reflecting the proposals of the Local Plan, is therefore now an area of proposed housing north of Keens Lane, an area of existing housing north of Gravetts Lane, the brook and golf course to the west and areas of open space to the north.

Site analysis

THE SITE

The site is an irregular shaped area of land covering approximately 45.52 hectares. It is located approximately 2km north west of Guildford town centre. Its boundaries are defined by the A322 to the east, Keens Lane and Gravetts Lane to the south, and by more open land to the west.

LAND USE

The site is primarily occupied by farmland with a significant portion of this being occupied by equestrian uses.

There are small clusters of dwellings within the site boundaries, primarily in the eastern portion of the site.

In addition, there is a recently-constructed Care Home towards the north eastern corner of the site, and a plant nursery close to the eastern boundary.

Existing residential neighbourhoods lie to the south and east of the site.

The south eastern quadrant of the site is a proposed housing allocation within the draft Guildford Borough Local Plan.

ACCESS AND MOVEMENT

The existing developed areas to the south and east of the site provide widespread pedestrian access, whilst a number of public rights of way terminate at the site’s north eastern boundary. These rights of way provide access to the attractive common land north east of the site.

There is a single public right of way which crosses the south eastern boundary of the site connecting Keens Lane with the A322.

There are existing bus services which run along the A322/Worplesdon Road connecting the site with Guildford town centre. From Guildford town centre, it is possible to take a direct train to central London.

At this early stage it would appear that vehicular access is possible from Keynes Lane on the site’s southern boundary, from Gravetts Lane on the southern boundary; and potentially from the A322/Worplesdon Road on the site’s northern boundary.

LANDSCAPE FEATURES AND ECOLOGY

In general terms, the site is more vegetated in its eastern portion with a network of hedgerows and trees forming field boundaries within this part of the site.

The western portion of the site is more open and there is less in the way of vegetated field boundaries.

It is likely that the vegetated field boundaries provide habitats for wildlife and should any development occur on the site, then clearly these will need to be retained wherever possible.

It should further be noted that large parts of the site are unconstrained by existing vegetation. Further detail on existing landscape conditions is provided in the accompanying landscape submission.

An existing watercourse forms the site’s western boundary, which again is likely to provide habitat for wildlife. Whilst disturbance to this should again be limited wherever possible, the proximity of the watercourse as wildlife habitat is not significant constraint to development.
TOPOGRAPHY

In general terms there is a shallow ridge line forming an east/west axis across the site. The site also slopes in a north-south direction from the site’s southern boundary. From the above mentioned ridge line, the site also slopes gently northward towards the site’s northern boundary.

Steeper slopes exist close to the western boundary and slope in a direction of the existing brook.

Whilst no parts of the site are expected to slope steeply enough to cause issues from an engineering perspective, the raised portions to the site do result in some portions of the site being more visually exposed than others. This is addressed in more detail below and within the accompanying Landscape Report.

VISUAL CONTEXT

The most visually exposed portion of the site lies towards the site’s western boundary and one viewpoint in particular allows views across this portion of the site. For a short section of the Worpleson Road on the site’s northern boundary, a view is aligned across the western portion of the site south westward towards the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It would be desirable from a landscape and visual impact perspective, therefore, to limit built development in the north western portion of the site.

By contrast the eastern portion of the site is enclosed by existing vegetation which suggests the possibility of built development without undue impact on the openness of the surrounding countryside.

It is considered that the southern portion of the western half of the site is capable of accommodating built development without undue visual impact.

There are no public rights of way across the west of the site, which further reduces views into it from this direction.

DRAINAGE

For the most part, the site is devoid of water bodies and water courses which might give rise to flood constraints.

However, the brook which forms the western boundary of the site does have an associated flood plain, although this encroaches very little into the main body of the site.

SERVICES & FACILITIES

The bus service that runs along Worplesdon Road connects the site with Guildford town centre to the south east.

A wide range of services and facilities are located within the town centre, with additional local services situated on Worplesdon Road and Pitch Place to the east in walking distance of the site (see plan opposite).

Opportunities and Constraints

Opportunities-

- The opportunity to provide a significant amount of housing and complimentary uses within easy reach of shops, services and facilities;
- The opportunity to establish new development in a site which, for the most part, is unconstrained by ecology or landscape designations;
- The opportunity to provide housing in a location with good access to open countryside and attractive recreational amenities;
- The opportunity to provide housing in a general location which is already considered acceptable for housing by the Local Planning Authority;
- The opportunity to support local shops and services through the provision of new housing;
- Opportunity to retain views across the north western corner of the site towards the Surrey Hills.
Constraints-

- The presence of the site within a designated Green Belt;
- The importance of retaining views across the north western corner of the site towards the Surrey Hills;
- The presence of two listed buildings within the site’s boundaries, albeit towards the periphery of the site;
- The presence of a 400m Special Protection Area buffer zone related to Whitmore Common;
- The need to respect the residential amenity of existing residents on Gravetts Lane through consideration of proposed orientation and siting of buildings.

Development proposals

There exists significant potential for an extension to the existing proposed housing allocation north of Keens Lane in the southern portion of the site.

There also exists potential for residential development in the southern half of the western portion of the site which is less visually exposed and lies adjacent to existing residential development on Gravetts Lane.

Beyond the existing proposed allocation, it is considered there is reasoned justification (supported by landscape analysis) for somewhere in the region of 348 dwellings which would be accessed from either Keens Lane, south of the site, or from Gravetts Lane at the centre of the site’s southern boundary which currently provides access to the equestrian uses, positioned centrally within the site.

Housing in this location would lie beyond the 400m buffer zone for the Whitmoor Common SPA and SSSI and would avoid encroachment into the more visually exposed north western corner of the site.

The site also provides the opportunity for the provision of a sizeable area of open space which could form Suitable Accessible Natural Green Space (SANG).

The laying out of open space in the northern portion of the site would allow connections between the proposed housing and the existing public rights of way and heathland north east of the site.

Within the development envelope and layout, consideration has been given to the existing vegetation (including trees, hedgerows, hedgerow trees and small copes and belts of woodland). These landscape elements have been retained (see below) as part of the preliminary landscape strategy and therefore can be integrated into the layout of a more detailed masterplan in the future. More detail on the landscape potential of the site is provided within the accompanying Landscape Report.

Summary

These proposals have the following advantages:

- They respond to the Council’s proposed allocation of Site A22;
- They create additional, public open space next to the urban area where accessible open space is in short supply;
- They provide SANG protection for effective mitigation of impacts on the SPA of the Council’s proposed site allocations A22, within close proximity;
- They respect physical constraints, including the setting of listed buildings and the long, open view southward towards the North Downs from Worplesdon Road;
- They maintain natural boundaries for the Green Belt, including the brook and its associated vegetation; and
- They provide additional opportunities for housing on the urban edge, within reach of facilities including schools, health services, public transport and local shops.

<see attachment for full appendices and document>

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

Attached documents: BRS.5358_A_PLANNING SUBMISSION (ALC) LR.PDF (4.2 MB)
Introduction

OVERVIEW

This report sets out an appraisal of the landscape and visual constraints and opportunities in respect of potential residential led development on the land to the north-west of Guildford, Surrey (Figure 1).

This preliminary landscape and visual appraisal (LVA) aims to determine the various landscape and visual constraints and opportunities of the promoted site, utilise the analysis to outline the landscape and green infrastructure strategy, and define a logical, rational and defensible boundary between the promoted site and its surrounding landscape context. This will be reviewed in the context of the landscape character and visual amenity of the local area.

Field work was carried out in July and August 2014 to review the existing landscape baseline and character of the area and its setting. This document summarises the appraisal and is supported by a series of figures to illustrate the analysis. A series of representative photographic views have been used to inform and illustrate the description of landscape character and the visual setting of the area.

Where applicable, the concept and procedures set out the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (3rd Edition, April 2013) have been adopted.

OVERVIEW OF POLICY & GREEN BELT

The Guildford Borough Local Plan was adopted in 2003, and the saved policies remain in effect under the direction given by Secretary of State in 2007.

The Local Plan 2003 will be replaced by the new Local Plan which is currently under consultation. The new Local Plan will set out the vision for the borough for growth and development up to 2031.

The promoted site and wider area is currently included in the Green Belt of Guildford Borough, the extent of which is currently under review as part of the preparation of the new Local Plan for the Borough.

Policy Context for Landscape and Visual Matters

EUROPEAN LANDSCAPE CONVENTION

The European Landscape Convention (ELC) promotes the protection, management and planning of European landscapes. The convention was adopted on 20 October 2000 and came into force on 1 March 2004. The ELC is designed to achieve improved approaches to the planning, management and protection of landscapes and defines landscape as:

“...an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors”

The importance of this definition is that it focuses on landscape as a resource in its own right and moves beyond the idea that landscapes are only a matter of aesthetics and visual amenity.

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and provides a framework within which the appropriate local council can produce local and neighbourhood plans; the NPPF is a material consideration in planning decisions.
The NPPF sets out three dimensions to achieving sustainable development that include economic, social and environmental considerations. It places an onus on the planning system to perform a role in relation to the environment that ‘contributes to the protection and enhancement of our natural, built and historic environment’ and this underpins the strategic guidance set out in the NPPF in relation to landscape and visual matters.

High quality design and local character are repeating themes through the core planning principles and more specific guidance on delivering sustainable development. Specific issues addressed by the core principles of the NPPF include:

• that decision making should secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings;
• that decision making should take account of the different roles and character of different areas and recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it (this also reflects the aims of the ELC); and
• that development should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment.

Under delivering sustainable development the guidance sets out a series of considerations relating to ‘good design’. This includes reference to sense of place, responding to local character and materials and aiming for visually attractive solutions and appropriate landscaping.

The NPPF notes the importance that designs ‘evolve’ in response to local issues and to the views of local communities and also sets out principles in relation to conservation and enhancement of the natural environment.

In relation to Green Belt the NPPF states: “...The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belt are their openness and their permanence.”

Green Belt serves five purposes:

• To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
• To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
• To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
• To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
• To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

PLANNING PRACTICE GUIDANCE

In March 2014 the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) launched a web based resource of planning practice guidance documents (PPG); these effectively supersede a series of previous advice and guidance documents.

Matters pertaining to ‘landscape’ are covered under the guidance for the Natural Environment. Para 001 addresses how the character of landscapes can be assessed to inform plan-making and planning decisions. It states that:

“One of the core principles in the National Planning Policy Framework is that planning should recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. Local plans should include strategic policies for the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment, including landscape. This includes designated landscapes but also the wider countryside.

Where appropriate, landscape character assessments should be prepared to complement Natural England’s National Character Area profiles. Landscape Character Assessment is a tool to help understand the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape and identify the features that give it a sense of place. It can help to inform, plan and manage change and may be undertaken at a scale appropriate to local and neighbourhood plan-making.”

The NPPF and PPG interpret landscape character as a key tool which can be used in plan making and decision taking.
This preliminary LVA includes reference to landscape character assessment prepared at a national, regional and local level and also addresses the key characteristics of the site and its immediate context and therefore responds fully to the requirement of the PPG.

With regard to open space and green infrastructure, in paragraph 001 of the Open space, sports and recreation facilities, public rights of way and local green space section, the PPG states that:

“...it [open space] can provide health and recreation benefits to people living and working nearby; have an ecological value and contribute to green infrastructure as well as being an important part of the landscape and setting of built development...”

The Design section (paragraph 007) of the guidance states that planning should promote local character including landscape setting. It considers that:

“Development should seek to promote character in townscape and landscape by responding to and reinforcing locally distinctive patterns of development, local man-made and natural heritage and culture, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation. The successful integration of all forms of new development with their surrounding context is an important design objective, irrespective of whether a site lies on the urban fringe or at the heart of a town centre.”

It also states that:

“When thinking about new development the site’s land form should be taken into account. Natural features and local heritage resources can help give shape to a development and integrate it into the wider area, reinforce and sustain local distinctiveness, reduce its impact on nature and contribute to a sense of place. Views into and out of larger sites should also be carefully considered from the start of the design process.”

Site Description and Context

LOCATION

The site is located on the north-west settlement edge of Guildford, covering the area of approximate 47.4 hectares (ha). Worplesdon Road (A322) defines the eastern and northern boundary of the site before the road turns toward the village Worplesdon (Figure 1). The southern boundary of the site is partly formed by Keens Lane and partly bordered with the rear gardens of a number of semi-detached properties along Gravetts Lane. A local watercourse with its associated vegetation forms the majority of the western site boundary, with the remaining short northern section of the western boundary defined by an existing belt of trees. Tangley Lane crosses the site from north to south connecting Worplesdon Road with Keens Lane and Gravetts Lane. A public right of way (public bridleway) connects Worplesdon Road to Chitty’s Common, passing across the south-east corner of the site.

CURRENT SITE USE

The site is mostly occupied by small to medium irregular shaped fields, which are bounded by thin hedgerows and trees, and used for pasture with some horse or sheep grazing. Several large residential properties and Worplesdon View Care Home are located along Worplesdon Road in the eastern and northern part of the site, set back in large plots. A small public open space lies along Worplesdon Road close to the south-east corner of the site with the public bridleway connecting Worplesdon Road to Keens Lane.

SETTLEMENT

Three main settlement areas are located close to the promoted site. To the immediate south-east lies the residential edge of Stoughton, comprising a variety of 20th century housing with landscaped gardens. Some commercial buildings also appear on the east side of Worplesdon Road within this residential area (such as a local car dealership). The village of Worplesdon is located c. 400m to the north-west of the site. A large part of the village is designated as conservation area and the village contains several listed buildings. The largest village settlement closeby is Fairlands situated c. 500m to closest point of the western boundary of the site. Aldershot Road (A323) flows along the north-east edge of Fairlands and provides a physical barrier between the Fairlands and the site. The building style of this village is typically 20th century pitched roof houses with landscaped gardens both in the front and back. A small village green is located in the central
area and there are a variety of verges along the roads or streets. The settlement is well connected to the adjacent green space by public footpath. Holly Lane links Worpleson with Fairland along this route; there are also several clusters of residential properties. A well-managed golf course (Rokers Golf Course) aligns with the A323 between Holly Lane and Gravetts Lane close to the western site boundary.

DESIGNATIONS

The site is located within an area currently designated as Green Belt. The extent of the Green Belt in this area is currently under review as part of the new Local Plan. Figure 1 shows the landscape related planning designations that are relevant to the site and surrounding area.

The designation closest to the site is Whitmoor Common, which is protected by Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA), designated as Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and also Local Nature Reserve. Part of the site falls within the 400m buffer of the SPA with the remaining area located within the 400m-5km zone.

The Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) is located over 3.5km to the south of the site. However due to the combined effect of distance, landform and vegetation cover, including the nature of the surrounding settlement pattern, there are not likely to be any impacts on this designated area.

Landscape and Visual Analysis

LANDSCAPE RESOURCES

Topography

The highest area (c. +45m AOD) of the site lies across the corner formed by Keens Lane and Tangle Lane and extends to Tangle Place Farm in the centre of the site. A small area close Keens Lane and Gravetts Lane reaches +50m AOD and forms the highest point of the site. From here the landform generally falls towards south to Gravetts Lane, west to the watercourse and north to Worpleson Road. The northern part of the site is relatively flat with the ground level below c. +40m AOD.

In the wider context, the site is located on the south-east side of the lowland valley situated between the settlements of Stoughton and Worpleson. The watercourse running along the western site boundary forms the lowest part this lowland valley and creates a natural barrier that contributes to the separation between the site and the landscape setting to the west (Figure 3, Topography).

Watercourses

The site is marked by several watercourses and ponds. The longest watercourse is the one forming the western edge of the site. It’s mostly well vegetated except a small section in the middle. The Flood Map for Planning on Environment Agency’s website shows the Flood Zone 2 & 3 is associated with this watercourse. There are three large ponds placed in the eastern part of the site covered by the dense vegetation. Some field ditches also appear in this part making connections between the ponds.

Public Rights of Way

There is one public right of way (PRoW) which crosses the site; this is a public bridleway, located on the south-east corner of the site which links Worpleson Road south-west toward Chitty’s Common.

In the surrounding area the network of public rights of way comprises a range of footpaths, bridleways and occasional by-ways which connect the various fringes of the urban area to adjacent open spaces and the green infrastructure network. To the north-east of the site Whitmoor Common is accessible via a number of PRoW, and to the south-east several footpaths cross an area of common adjacent to Fairlands.

Vegetation
Vegetation on site consists of pastures, field boundary vegetation, and small groups of trees and woodland. Hedgerows vary in height, degree of management and age. Large mature trees are sparse along the field boundaries, individually or as groups. Small woodland areas are located at the north-east corner of the site and provide green infrastructure connections to the neighbouring Whitmoor Common. A belt of trees located along Keens Lane links to the adjacent Chitty’s Common. Generally, tree coverage is much higher on the eastern part of the site providing a continuous vegetated corridor connecting Whitmoor Common and Chitty’s Common.

In the wider context, vegetation in the rural landscape to the immediate south and west of the site is similar to that on site. Vegetation in the Whitmoor Common to the north-east of the site shows a much denser approach. The vegetation in Rokers Golf Course is in its early years of establishment and under the layout of the golf course it offers a completely different pattern.

Roads tend to be edged by woodland in general and due to the extent of this network there is a strong framework of trees and woodland which characterise the area.

LANDSCAPE CHARACTER

The site and its wider setting coincide with areas of landscape described under the following existing character assessments as shown on Figure 4, Landscape Character.

National Character Area (NCA) – Natural England (February 2013)

• NCA 129: Thames Basin Heaths
• NCA 114: Thames Basin Lowland

The future of Surrey’s landscape and woodlands – Surrey County Council (1997)

• Thames Basin Heaths – Western Surrey
• Thames Basin Lowlands - Wanborough

Guildford Landscape Character Assessment & Guidance - Guildford Borough Council (January 2007)

Volume 1 Rural Assessment

Landscape Type (1:50,000)

• E Wooded Rolling Clayland
• G Wooded and Settled Sandy Heaths
• Character Area (1:25,000)
• E1 Wanborough Wooded Rolling Claylands
• G1 Worpleston Wooded and Settled Sandy Heaths

Volume 2 Rural-Urban Fringe Assessment Rural-Urban Fringe Character Area (1:10,000)

• E1 Rydeshill-Fairlands Rural Urban Fringe
• G1 Worpleston Rural-Urban Fringe

National Landscape Character

NCA 129 Thames Basin Heaths

Key characteristics:

• High woodland cover;
• Small to medium-sized fields with woods;
• Mainly pasture land, with a mix of uses including forestry, golf course and horse paddocks;
• Historic commons offer tranquillity and unenclosed views; and
• Valley floors are wet with ditches, numerous watercourses, ponds.
NCA 114 Thames Basin Lowland

Key characteristics:

- Gently undulating lowlands and flat valley plains
- A pastoral landscape interspersed with woodland and shaws, hedgerows and trees, remnant commons, villages and farmsteads;
- Fragmentised farmland character;
- Sparser settlement; and
- Numerous major road and rail networks criss-cross the area.

Regional Landscape Character

Thames Basin Heaths – Western Surrey
A low lying, undulating, extensive scale landscape with dense tree cover, heathland and pockets of small scale farmland.

Key characteristics:

- Open expanses of heathland, often enclosed by woodland, allow exhilarating views;
- Low density housing with large established gardens, golf courses and parkland; and
- Small fields are enclosed by low hedges or tall lines of trees and shrubs.

Thames Basin Lowlands – Wanborough
A gently rolling, open, medium scale farmed landscape with few woodlands.

Key characteristics:

- Small to medium size irregularly shaped fields are divided by a mixture of low and tall hedges;
- Field trees mark the lines of old hedges; and
- Settlements are small and scattered with a few small pockets of suburbia.

Local Landscape Character

Guildford Landscape Character Assessment & Guidance - Guildford Borough Council (January 2007)

Landscape Type E Wooded Rolling Claylands

Key characteristics:

- Gently rolling lowland;
- A mix of land uses with pastoral farmland, woodland and historic parkland; and
- Varied sized settlements from scattered farmsteads and small villages, to substantial areas of large 20th dwellings.

Landscape Type G: Wooded and Settled Sand Heath

Key characteristics:

- Gently rolling landscape;
- Frequent commons, large woodland create an enclosed landscape with glimpses to pastures;
- Scattered settlement; and
- An intimate, sometimes hidden landscape with views framed by woodland.

Landscape Character Area E1 Rydeshill – Fairlands Rural-Urban Fringe
The site is located within this character area. The character area covers the rural urban fringe west of Guildford extending
from the Royal Surrey Hospital site and Rydeshill on the urban edge, encompassing the small commons that characterise the landscape to the west of Guildford and the satellite suburb of Fairlands.

Key characteristics:

- Relatively level, flat landscape and cannot generally be perceived from within the urban area;
- small fields, bounded by thin hedgerows and fences predominantly;
- a range of smaller scale mixed land uses including small holdings, nursery gardens and rifle range form a variable urban fringe landscape on the edge to the east of Tangle Lane;
- linear red brick development alongside road facing directly onto the commons or greens;
- Some large farm complexes and occasional grander old houses;
- The small fingers of common land such as Chitty’s Common extend into the urban fabric; and
- The transition from rural landscape to the residential development is marked by back garden boundaries, which abut directly onto the common land and or farmland.

Landscape Character Area G1 Worplesdon Rural-Urban Fringe

The Worplesden Sandy Heaths form a distinct landscape to the north west of Guildford comprising a mosaic of heath and wooded common land interspersed with areas of pasture and horse grazing.

Key characteristics:

- Low-lying topography;
- mixed land cover mosaic of scrub, heath and woodland
- Whitmoor Common SPA – internationally important habitats;
- The commons joining the urban area provide a rapid physical and visual transition between town and country;
- The buildings are typical of common edge settlement.

VISUAL ANALYSIS

This section provides a brief description of the nature and extent of the existing views from, towards and between the site and the surrounding area. It makes reference to a series of representative photographic viewpoints, the locations of which are illustrated on Figure 5, Viewpoint Locations & PRoW, with the viewpoints themselves set out on Figure 6, Viewpoint Photographs.

Overall, views to the site vary due to the combined influence of topography, built form and intervening vegetation. However, in general the site and its context are relatively well contained with views towards it being of short or medium distance. Occasional long distance views are limited and only gained from specific locations.

The sensitivity of visual receptors is based on value attached to a view and also the susceptibility of change. Judgements on the value attached to a view include recognition of formal designations and/or local value. The susceptibility to changes in views is judged based on the activity of people experiencing the view (at any given time or location) and the extent to which their attention would be focused on the view (rather than on the activity being undertaken).

Receptors of the highest sensitivity will include those engaged in outdoor recreation whose attention is likely to be focussed on the landscape, for example public rights of way in the open countryside. Alternatively they may include those receptors where views of the surroundings are an important contributor to the experience and visit, for example tourists and visitors to heritage asset (or other attraction), designated or protected views or receptors with views from dwellings. Receptors of lower sensitivity will include those travelling through the landscape on roads, rail or other transport routes where this involves recognised scenic routes and an awareness of views and visual amenity.

For visual receptors the degree of change is related to the size and scale of change in any given viewpoint due to the extent of loss, addition or alteration of features, the changes to the composition of the view including the proportion of the view occupied by the proposal, the degree of contrast and the nature of the experience. The geographical extent in relation to the angle, distance and extent of visibility and the duration of impacts also contributes to the degree of change.
The western part of the site is the most exposed with both short and middle distance views possible from properties along Holly Lane and Gravetts Lane. This includes receptors engaged in outdoor recreation, and vehicle users passing along A323, Holly Lane and Worplesdon Road. The views from properties in the Fairlands settlement are, in general, screened by the vegetation both along A323 and in the surrounding network of fields.

From the south, the majority of views from residential properties, south of Keens Lane toward the site are screened by the tall vegetation along Keens Lane and the houses on Gravetts Lane. People living on Gravetts Lane with the aspect of the rear garden facing the site boundary are likely to have clear views to the site. However the visibility of the site, when travelling along the roads, is generally screened by the built form and vegetation.

From the east, the visual envelope of the site is contained by the urban edge of Guildford at Stoughton, including the tree belts along the Worplesdon Road.

From the north, the small woodland at north-east corner of the site restricts the views toward the site from vehicle user and people walking along Worplesdon Road. However, as the landform drops down and fewer trees planted, the views to the site are open up when approaching the north-west corner of the site. These views extend to the long distance and are possibly perceived by residents living in the property opposite, people walking along the footpath, and vehicles travelling along Worplesdon Road. Although Worplesdon is situated on a much higher ground (c. +60m AOD) compared to the site, potential views to the site are very restricted due to the large woodland block in-between and varied vegetations throughout.

Some possible locations of obtaining long distance views have also been visited including the some public footpaths to the north of A31 in the Surrey Hills AONB. However the site is hardly visible from those locations due to the combined effect of distance, topography and vegetation.

**Potential Landscape and Visual Impacts**

**THE DEVELOPMENT**

The site being promoted comprises an area of land to the north-west of Guildford. The site is located to the west and south of the A322 as it curves through the area connecting Guildford to Worplesdon, to the north of Keens Lane and Gravetts Lane and to the east of a local watercourse which flows between Rydes Hill and Broadstreet Common (at Fairlands) and Whitmoor Common (to the north-east of the A322).

Development of the site is likely to include a residentially led master plan for development of mixed housing, new highways infrastructure (including internal road layouts and access) along with a network of green infrastructure and open spaces incorporating pedestrian and cycle linkages, community sports provision, formal and informal children’s play, strategic landscaping and sustainable drainage systems. In this location there will also be a requirement for the provision of suitable alternative natural green space (SANGs) which will form an integral part of the proposals for the promoted site and would create improved access opportunities to areas of countryside, which would not currently be available for public access.

**LANDSCAPE VALUE AND SUSCEPTIBILITY**

Although the countryside has some intrinsic sensitivity, when considering landscape and visual impacts, the sensitivity of a landscape is specific to the location in question (in terms of value) and also to the particular project or development that is being proposed (in terms of the susceptibility of a landscape to a specific type of change).

Therefore, in order to understand the likely impacts on a landscape it is necessary to look at the specific context of the fringe landscape of Guildford and in relation to potential for residentially led development.

Landscape value is the value attached to a potentially affected landscape. It is relative in relation to the different stakeholders and different parts of society that use or experience a landscape. Although factors such as formal designations are an important component when determining value, other aspects are also considered as part of the judgement process. These include issues related to condition (of features and elements), seclusion, presence of detracting...
influences and also rarity and the degree of representativeness. Landscape value will vary in response to the specific landscape that is being considered, even where a landscape is included in the boundaries of a formal designation.

Landscape susceptibility is the ability of an area to accommodate change without undue consequences for the maintenance of the baseline situation. In this context, the term landscape receptors can be expanded to cover landscape character areas, the condition of a particular landscape character type or an individual landscape element or feature. Landscape susceptibility will vary in response to the specific landscape that is being considered and to the nature of the type of change that may occur.

The susceptibility of the landscape to residentially led development is determined as an integral part of the appraisal of likely impacts, at a point where the components of a proposed development have been analysed and potential key causes of impact are understood.

LIKELY KEY IMPACTS

The baseline section of this appraisal has considered the characteristics and intrinsic sensitivity of the landscape to the north-west of Guildford. The following section sets out a review of the types of impact generating activities that would generally be associated with residentially led development.

Causes of impacts at completion

The permanent components of residentially led development which may give rise to impacts on landscape and visual receptors include:

- The built form of residential development (also incorporating the internal highways layout and hierarchy of streets);
- The resulting increase in the urban area of Guildford, notably to the north-west of the settlement and associated pressure on retained areas of landscape on the urban fringe; and
- Mitigation integrated into the proposed development (i.e. green infrastructure, open space and strategic landscaping), including retained trees, woodland and hedgerows, landscaped attenuation areas, open space provision and new planting.

Consideration of likely impacts

The analysis of likely impacts of residentially led development is used at the initial stages of the design process to in order to shape a suitable development envelope which avoids or minimises the key potential impacts. In the context of the promoted site and its surrounding local landscape character, these judgements can be use to inform the analysis of constraints and opportunities which can then be used to guide the preliminary design stages of a proposal in a positive manner.

The incorporation of mitigation at the earliest stages of the design process will ensure that the promoted site responds to the landscape components of the promoted site and also the local landscape context. This approach works with the positive attributes and identifiable landscape features of the promoted site and will therefore present a logical development envelope and landscape strategy that is physically and visually contained and works to create a clear defensible boundary to the edge of Guildford.

There are likely to be some residual impacts and it is this level of impacts which determines the overall harm, and whether a development is acceptable in landscape and visual terms.

Landscape and Visual Constraints and Opportunities

OVERVIEW

The following section sets out an analysis of the constraints and opportunities related to the promoted site. This will then be used to formulate a landscape strategy and development envelope. The approach ensures that potential landscape and visual impacts are minimised and demonstrates how the promoted site can deliver a robust and defensible edge to the Green Belt in relation to the settlement limit of Guildford and in a manner which responds to local landscape character.

LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL CONSTRAINTS
• Part of the promoted site sits at a localised topographical high point, rising from c. +36m at Worplesdon Road to +50m AOD at Keens Lane and Gravetts Lane. In the immediate context, the promoted site sits above a shallow valley formed by the nearby watercourse;
• The existing nearby watercourse which forms a delineating physical landscape feature through the area between Guildford and Fairlands (and also Worplesdon);
• The presence of hedgerows, hedgerow trees and small woodland copses/belts which form the existing green infrastructure framework on the promoted site;
• The presence of a public bridleway to the south-east corner of the promoted site (currently linking Keens Lane and Worplesdon Road);
• Some areas of designated Common Land on and directly adjacent to the promoted site;
• The rural character of some local roads, including Tangle Lane;
• Potential issues of coalescence between the north-western edge of Guildford and the nearby settlements of Worplesdon and Fairlands;
• Some available long distance views to the Surrey Hills AONB from the promoted site and adjacent roads (i.e. views looking south to the rising scarp and ridgeline);
• Proximity of the south-eastern edge of Worplesdon Conservation Area to the north-west of the promoted site and also two Listed Buildings (Tangley Cottage and Pitch Place House) on the promoted site; and
• The presence of the 400m buffer to the SPA/SSSI designations which preclude residential development in this area.

LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL OPPORTUNITIES

In the wider landscape the promoted site sits in the context of a wider shallow valley which rises from c. +40m AOD (in relation to the promoted site) to c. +60m at Worplesdon, to the east of Fairlands and on the existing western edge of Guildford. This increases the potential physical and visual containment of the site, subsequently reducing its susceptibility to development and contributing to capacity;

The proximity of the promoted site to arterial highway routes (including the A322 and A323) which provide opportunities to consider locations for points of access which will avoid impacts on other local roads which are more rural in their character;

Working within the framework of existing green infrastructure on the promoted site to guide the development layout in a manner which responds to local landscape character;

Provision of new green infrastructure links across the promoted site to enhance connectivity in terms of both access and biodiversity, including links between larger areas of designated Common Land to the north and south;

The SPA/SSSI buffer zone and designated Common Land both within and directly adjacent to the promoted site, providing opportunities to focus the landscape strategy for green infrastructure and open spaces around these established areas and promoting connections and links in terms of access and biodiversity;

Utilising the existing physical landscape feature of the nearby watercourse (and associated linear tree belts) to retain and enhance a strong green infrastructure framework on the western edge of the promoted site which will physically and visually contain the promoted site and also represent a clear and defensible boundary to the Green Belt;

Ancient woodland located on the outside edge, adjacent to the boundary of the promoted site, providing opportunities to protect and enhance this landscape feature through additional planting and green infrastructure connections; and

Referencing existing views and view corridors to the distant AONB (Surrey Hills to the south) to guide the extent and layout of the development envelope within the promoted site.

Preliminary Landscape Strategy

THE AIM
The preliminary landscape strategy for the promoted site has been led by landscape character and visual amenity. This has drawn on the preliminary appraisal of landscape and visual impacts and the early identification of constraints and opportunities. It has also drawn on the opportunities and constraints identified for the site but also in the context of the surrounding area.

Mitigation measures are intended to prevent, reduce, remedy or offset adverse effects of a development proposal and these are taken forward through an iterative approach to design and appraisal.

The mitigation measures for the proposed development aim to:

- Conserve and enhance the surrounding landscape character;
- Retain and make best use of existing landscape elements and features;
- Optimise protection and screening for visual amenity receptors; and
- Avoid loss or damage to retained landscape elements and features.

THE PRINCIPLES

It is considered that with an appropriate approach to mitigation and the implementation of a robust landscape and green infrastructure strategy, a scheme for residentially led development on the promoted site will be physically and visually well contained, show clear defensible boundaries and, overall, will be acceptable in landscape and visual terms.

The landscape and green infrastructure strategy for the promoted site (Figure 8) is founded on the following principles:

- Identification of a ‘development envelope’ for the promoted site, the extent of which pays particular attention to the existing landscape features and local landscape character, particularly the strong framework of vegetation which characterises the area and also the nearby watercourse which provides an existing physical landscape feature and suggests a logical and robust edge to the west;
- Proposed retention and enhancement of the existing vegetation on the promoted site, including the hedgerow field boundaries and small copse and belts of woodland and, in particular, building on the linear belt of trees and woodland which follows the alignment of the nearby watercourse;
- Creation of additional vegetation infrastructure on the promoted site, taking into account visual containment and mitigation that is both consistent with, and complementary to, the existing local landscape character in terms of scale, disposition and species mix;
- Consideration of the landscape designations across the promoted site and its immediate landscape context, including the setting of Worpleston and the Conservation Area, Common Land, nearby ancient woodland and ecological buffer’s which all contribute to the formation of green infrastructure and open space as an integral part of the promoted site; and
- The retention and enhancement of a robust and defensible boundary on the western edge of the promoted site, formed by the existing physical landscape feature of the watercourse and associated tree belts and augmented by additional green infrastructure and open space.

THE APPROACH

Development envelope and layout

The development envelope for the promoted site pays particular attention to a number of landscape related constraints and opportunities; this includes the internal vegetation structure of hedgerows and hedgerow trees and the opportunity to retain long distance vistas from the promoted site (and from the A322 further north) toward the ridgeline of the Surrey Hills AONB. The development envelope has also incorporated areas of Common Land. Whilst the SPA/SSSI buffer is predominantly an ecological designation, this has the benefit of restricting the development envelope to the north of the site and providing additional offset to the south-east corner of Worpleston Conservation Area.

A key matter for defining the limits of the development envelop is the creation of a robust western boundary to the promoted site. This is formed by the alignment of the watercourse and associated linear tree belts. This existing physical landscape feature has then been augmented through proposals for additional green infrastructure and open space which further restricts the western edge of the development envelope to ensure that the boundary to the promoted site is robust...
and defensible in the long term. This approach also ensures that there is physical and visual containment of the promoted site on its western edge to balance that provided by existing green infrastructure and settlement to the south, east and north.

This approach ensures that at the outset of the design process the constraints and opportunities which are specific to the site and surrounding context are considered and addressed by the design process. This in turn promotes a better quality of design and a scheme which can develop in a way that responds to local landscape character.

**Existing vegetation strategy**

Within the development envelope and layout, consideration has been given to the existing vegetation (including trees, hedgerows, hedgerow trees and small copses and belts of woodland). These landscape elements have been retained as part of the preliminary landscape strategy and therefore can be integrated into the layout of a more detailed masterplan in the future. This includes the orientation and layout of residential plots in a manner where landscaped elements can be incorporated into the garden space, boundaries, green infrastructure or open spaces. This approach includes appropriate stand offs to trees and hedgerows which will help to avoid potential impacts on root protection zones of these elements during construction activity in the future.

In some instances, these existing landscape elements will be reinforced and enhanced through additional landscaping and improved management; the aims of which will consider location, function and also biodiversity objectives.

**Green infrastructure and open space**

Green infrastructure and open space has guided the formation and extent of the development envelope. The retained areas of green infrastructure ensure that the built form of the proposed development will be contained in a robust and diverse framework of open spaces. The strategy for retaining existing vegetation combined with proposals for extensive landscaping will provide a range of green infrastructure at differing stages of establishment and maturity which will enhance the quality of the proposed development and also help to integrate the site into the local landscape character.

At detailed design the selection of species for trees and woodland will refer to native species and as well as those present in the context of the local landscape character.

**Summary and conclusions**

This appraisal has been prepared with reference to a parcel of landscape located to the north-west edge of Guildford; this area has been identified as a potentially suitable location for sustainable residential development (the promoted site). In order to determine the suitability of the promoted site to accommodate residentially led development, the appraisal has identified the landscape and visual constraints and opportunities which are present on the promoted site and in its immediate surrounding landscape context.

The appraisal has addressed the following landscape resources and visual receptors:

- Landscape character, including physical landscape features and elements; and
- Views and visual amenity experienced by residents, recreational users (including visitors and tourists) and road users.

The promoted site is not subject to any specific landscape designations; however there are a number of formal designations which have landscape associations. This includes the presence of registered Common Land both on and adjacent to the promoted site, two Listed Buildings (on site) and a Conservation Area (at Worplesdon). There is an area of ancient woodland located adjacent to, but out with, the north-western boundary of the promoted site and also the north-eastern area of the promoted site is included within a 400m buffer to a SSSI (Whitmoor Common) and an SPA (Thames Basin Heaths).

Overall, the promoted site and wider area is currently included in the Green Belt of Guildford Borough, the extent of which is currently under review as part of the preparation of the new Local Plan for the Borough.
There is comprehensive coverage of landscape character at a regional and local level by published landscape character studies. At a local level the site is located in the Wooded Rolling Claylands (LCT) and Wanborough Wooded Rolling Claylands (LCA), the key characteristics and landscape guidelines of which have also been used to inform the constraints and opportunities and subsequent landscape strategy.

The promoted site is well contained both physically and visually. Notwithstanding the small, localised high points of the landform north of Keens Road and west of Tangle Lane, the overall topographical characteristic of the area is that of a shallow valley, falling from the surrounding landscape areas to the east (Guildford) and west (Fairlands) and north (Worplesdon) toward the shallow valley formation and local watercourse which flows between Broadstreet Common and Whitmoor Common.

Combined with the close proximity and links to the existing urban form of Guildford (to the east and south) and the mosaic of vegetation cover present along the road network and nearby smaller settlements the visual envelope is well contained. There are some distant views from the promoted site to the wider landscape however these are specific, channelled vistas and from the wider landscape, the promoted site is not prominent in views.

A number of constraints and opportunities have been identified on the promoted site. Along with an analysis of the type of development which would be proposed and identification of likely landscape and visual impacts which are likely to occur, these have been used to develop a preliminary landscape strategy. This includes a robust strategy for green infrastructure, open space and strategic landscaping.

The main purposes of Green Belt aim to check unrestricted urban sprawl, prevent the merging of neighbouring towns, safeguard the countryside from encroachment and preserve the setting of historic towns. The preliminary landscape strategy for the promoted site has responded to the constraints and opportunities presented by physical landscape components, landscape character and visual amenity of the surrounding area.

From this analysis the inclusion of a robust buffer along the western edge of the promoted site has evolved. This buffer is concentrated on the existing physical landscape feature of the watercourse and its associated vegetation. Along with the constraints on development presented by the stand-off required in the northern area of the promoted site (largely driven by eco-logical justifications due to the SPA/SSSI designations) this ensures the retention of open, undeveloped land which will prevent the merging of Guildford with Fairlands or Worplesdon. This key principle of the preliminary landscape strategy is supported and augmented through a range of other landscape mitigation measure that would integrate the promoted site with its surroundings and ensure that development proposals are landscape led and integrated with local landscape character.

A development proposal for the promoted site is likely to result in only limited harm at a localised level and limited in the immediate context of the promoted site; therefore the potential landscape and visual effects of such a development proposal are not likely to be significant. As such a landscape led, residential masterplan for the promoted site is likely to be acceptable in landscape and visual terms.

This is based on the positive attributes of the site in its current context, which is closely related to the existing settlement edge of Guildford, the degree of existing enclosure (created by existing urban form, the local road network and green infrastructure) and the opportunity to create a robust and defensible boundary to the Green Belt on the western edge of the promoted site. It is consid-ered that, subject to the incorporation and evolution of the preliminary landscape strategy, it would not be necessary to maintain this edge of Guildford as permanently open and that the promoted site could be brought forward with a development proposal which respects and enhances local landscape character and would not compromise the purpose of the remaining Green Belt areas between Guildford, Fairlands and Worplesdon.

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

Attached documents:  

![BRS.5358_Preliminary LVA Low Res 15072016.pdf](2.6 MB)

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6367  Respondent: 9037793 / T.B. Carter  Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the proposed development A22 in Keens Lane. It is in the Green Belt. The road (Keens Lane) is far too narrow. As it is there are many near misses! Tangle Lane is also narrow which it joins at the roundabout. Worplesdon Road and the Aldershot Road are often at a stand still. The Infrastructure is totally unsuitable.

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

Attached documents:

Site A22 Land to the north of Keens Lane

OBJECT.

1. It is good Green Belt. The reason given for dropping the neighbouring Liddington Hall site is because of the "high sensitivity Green Belt". The same should apply to the Keens Lane site.

2. It is part of the important wild life corridor between Whitmoor and Broadstreet Commons. As such, developing the site would conflict with PPF paras 113, 117, 118, and 119.

1. It is very close to the SPA of Whitmoor Common and the drainage to the Common from the development could not be gainsaid (see the comment on Policy 5). None of the suggested SANGs would offer reliability like an al

2. It would add to the chronic traffic congestion in the sector (see Policy J1). Traffic is a major factor that has been cited in the rulings of three previous proposed developments in this immediate area: In 1976, the inspector recommended: "The proposed development, in my opinion, would further impair the efficiency of both the A323 and A322 - which, as principal roads connecting Guildford to the M3 and the major growth area, must be safeguarded ..... ". In 1983, the County Engineer wrote to the then MP concerning the Surrey Structure Plan: "Accordingly the County Council as Highway Authority will seek to prevent the grant of any planning permission which would significantly increase traffic to the south of Liddington Hall. ". In 1985, in spite of the above, an attempt was made by the County Council to build on Liddington Hall Farm, which at that time they owned. The Inspector recommended: "In my judgement, the discharge to A322/A323 of traffic from 700 dwellings additional to that arising from expected development at Tilehouse, Stoughton and from general growth of traffic would add unacceptably to prevailing congestion and danger on the main framework roads."

3. Great Crested Newts have been found and photographed immediately either side of the s. They are a protected species.

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

Attached documents:
Policy A22: Land north of Keens Lane, Guildford – OBJECT

I object to the increase of housing provision for this site in the revised 2017 Local Plan. The site was unsuitable previously and any increase in housing numbers will only make matters worse. The adverse factors are so strong that I find it amazing the site is being put forward for an increase of any size. Some of them are listed below:

1. a) It is good Green Belt. The reason given for dropping the neighbouring Liddington Hall site is because of the “high sensitivity Green Belt”. The same should apply to the Keens Lane site.
2. b) It is part of the important wildlife corridor between Whitmoor and Broadstreet Commons. As such, developing the site would conflict with NPPF paras 113, 117, 118, and 119.
3. c) It is very close to the SPA of Whitmoor Common and the damage to the Common from the development could not be gainsaid (see the comment on Policy 5). None of the SANGs that have been suggested would offer anything like an alternative.
4. d) It would add to the chronic traffic congestion in the sector. Traffic is a major factor that has been cited in the rulings in the rejection of three previous proposed developments in this immediate area:
   In 1976, the inspector recommended: "The proposed development, in my opinion, would further impair the efficiency of both the A323 and A322 which, as principal roads connecting Guildford to the M3 and the major growth area, must be safeguarded......".
   In 1983, the County Engineer wrote to the then MP concerning the Surrey Structure Plan: “Accordingly the County Council as Highway Authority will seek to prevent the grant of any planning permission which would significantly increase traffic to the south of Liddington Hall”. In 1985, in spite of the above, an attempt was made by the County Council to build on Liddington Hall Farm, which at that time they owned. The Inspector recommended: “In my judgement, the discharge to A322/A323 of traffic from 700 dwellings additional to that arising from expected development at Tilehouse, Stoughton and from general growth of traffic would add unacceptably to prevailing congestion and danger on the main framework roads.”
   In 2003, the Officer Report to the Executive on the Deposit Draft Surrey Structure Plan 2002 stated: “The findings thus far suggest that the transport impacts associated with the north west community [the Liddington Hall site] would be significant and difficult to resolve.”
   These previous rulings are vital and cannot be ignored.
5. e) Keens Lane is too narrow in much of its length for two cars to pass each other, and the increase in traffic generated by the development (or any development here) presents a hazard. Any increase in traffic along Gravettes Lane and Tangley Lane is hazardous, given their narrow width, high banks and hedgerows, and an acute blind corner.
6. f) Great Crested Newts have been found and photographed immediately either side of the site. They are a protected species.

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

Attached documents:
Dear Sirs,

I object to the inclusion of land off Keens Lane, Worplesdon (Site A22) in the GBC Draft Local Plan for the proposed development of 140 homes and a care home and believe this is inappropriate for three main reasons:

1. The area is Green Belt, which should be retained and not built on. I am appending at the end of this email* the agreed Policy of Surrey County Council for your reference and urge that the green belt be protected by Guildford Borough Council.

2. Keens Lane is a narrow road (the word "lane" is a clue) and building more homes there would entail the widening of the road, but this does not account for the fact that at the far end, near to Gravetts Lane/Tangley Lane, is constricted and the area is already congested,

3. The proposed development site is close to Whitmoor Common and a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and would have a damaging effect on ecology and wildlife. It is also bounded by Broadstreet Common. The open nature of Worplesdon should be retained.

* It is Surrey County Council policy (March 2013) by a Motion agreed at a Full Council meeting of Surrey County Council about the Green Belt:

Surrey County Council, March 2013
RESOLVED (unanimously):

Council notes:

1. Surrey County Council has a proud history as the creator of the Green Belt. The County’s Countryside Estate founded by the Surrey County Council Act of 1931 was the basis of the London County Council's Green Belt Act of 1938.
1. The Coalition Agreement states:

'We will maintain the Green Belt, Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and other environmental protections, and create a new designation – similar to SSSIs –to protect green areas of particular importance to local communities.'

Council believes:

Surrey’s Green Belt, Countryside Estate, SSSIs and other green spaces are vital, not only for the county’s environment but also for maintaining a “green lung” around London.

Council resolves:

1. To use its power to protect Surrey’s Green Belt.
2. To support the National Planning Policy Framework (section 9 – paragraphs 79 to 92) and the Government’s policy of protecting the Green Belt.
3. To make Surrey’s MPs and the County’s Districts and Boroughs aware of this resolution.

4. That any Green Belt development in the County is in line with the needs and wishes of Surrey residents

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7392  Respondent: 10441057 / Guy Kelly  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22

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

There is a lot of wildlife in the area, my Mum’s home is directly opposite site A22 where there is an abundance of wildlife, even stag beetles which are endangered and protected. Frogs, birds, foxes, all sorts of things will be lost if the 140 planned homes and a care home are built on it.

I disagree with the proposal of many traveller pitches in Guildford, [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered contrary to the Council’s duty under the Equalities Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected characteristic; and to foster good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it]

The land off Keens Lane, Worplesdon (Site A22) in the GBC Draft Local Plan for the proposed development of 140 homes and a care home I believe is inappropriate for three main reasons:

1. The area is Green Belt, which should be retained and not built on. I am appending at the end of this email* the agreed Policy of Surrey County Council for your reference and urge that the green belt be protected by Guildford Borough Council.

2. Keens Lane is a narrow road (the word "lane" is a clue) and building more homes there would entail the widening of the road, but this does not account for the fact that at the far end, near to Gravettes Lane/Tangley Lane, it is constricted and the area is already congested. Since the new housing has been built the traffic in the lane is uncontrolled and many cars speed along it. There are often near collisions on the brow of the hill on the lane as traffic speeds faster and faster and I fear for my sister who often rides her horse along it and encounters drivers who have no consideration for welfare of her or her horse and don’t slow down.

3. The proposed development site is close to Whitmoor Common and a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and would have
a damaging effect on ecology and wildlife. It is also bounded by Broadstreet Common. The open nature of Worplesdon should be retained.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3242  Respondent: 10443489 / Vincent Withams  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22

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

The 140 residencies and care home development on Keens Lane will impact again on the greenbelt, the area is already choked with traffic and choked with pollution. Keen lane is a single lane road

how on earth will it cope with additional traffic. The development is very close to Whitmore common and would impact on the sensitive ecology of the area. The proposed development is sited on a vital

wildlife corridor between Whitmoor and broad street common, such corridors being a matter of major government concern.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7058  Respondent: 10540609 / D R Medhurst  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22

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

I object to the proposal of building 140 new dwellings plus a care home on land bordering Keens Lane for three main reasons:

1. The site being proposed is in very close proximity to Whitmoor common which is a designated SPA and as such should be protected from the affects that any nearby housing would bring.
2. Keens Lane would loose completely its current rural charm.
3. The area is designated Green Belt and as such should not be built upon.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3406  Respondent: 10568897 / Susan Walsh  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Ref: Draft Local Plan – Objection to proposed development on site A22

140 homes and a care home on land north of Keens Lane

Further to your draft plans outlining the development of the above area please note my objection on several counts.

Before I list them I am at a loss to understand why Guildford, which is currently a moderate sized market town, would need expansion at the levels you propose. I do understand that some additional housing needs to be provided although I do not agree that in Guildford it could ever be described as “affordable” but the proposals you are making are vast and will change the dynamics of this presently lovely place to live into another blot on the landscape and a characterless place to live.

Regarding the proposals for a development of 140 homes and a care home, (Site A22) my objections are as follows:

The area north of Keens Lane is Green Belt and should be retained and not built on. It is the councils responsibility to protect this land and it should only be reclaimed for house building in extreme situations which your current plan to build so many new homes cannot be considered extreme.

1. The current traffic situation for the local residents is becoming increasingly difficult with Gravetts Lane and Keens Park Road often being used as a rat run. Even if the road is widened this will not accommodate the huge increase in traffic created by so many new homes trying to filter onto the Worplesdon and Aldershot Roads. The roads in this area are already heavily congested and it beggars belief why you are so intent on making things so much worse, Guildford does not have the infrastructure this side of the town for this huge development.

1. The proposed development site is close to a Site of Special Scientific, Whitmoor Common in particular. Your plan is very alarming and would be certain to have a damaging effect on ecology and wildlife no matter what was put in place to try to avoid this. The green space between Guildford and Worplesdon should be maintained to allow a green corridor for flora and fauna.

I sincerely hope my objections will be recorded and taken into account when your final plans are submitted, it is very important to listen to the residents objections and concerns.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3533  Respondent: 10665473 / Angela Bourke  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A22

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

I would like to make an objection comment to Policy number A22 Keens Lane.

I object to the increase of proposed new homes from 140 to 150, and to the narrowness of Keen Lane to accommodate the increase of traffic, and access for the construction vehicles.

The access roads for Keens Lane, Gravett's Lane from the Aldershot Road and Tangleay Lane from the main Worplesdon Road are not standard width main roads either, they are too narrow to take large construction vehicles and potential extra traffic, part of Gravett's Lane goes down to single track lane due to residential parking, and the turn off for Tangleay Lane from Worplesdon Road is a very sharp, tight left turn. There is also flooding issues in the area.
The extra traffic to Keen Lane will also put extra pressure on roads in the immediate area, like the Aldershot Road and Worplesdon Road, there would also be extra pressure on the local supply services like water, sewage, schools.

I would also like to make some general comments on the Local Plan overall. The reduction in the numbers of homes built in the plan is good but I hope not to the detriment to affordable, social housing which I have heard can be the case. I also hope plans to drastically improve our road infrastructure and local supply services will run alongside the local plan, otherwise I can see Guildford's roads being even more congested and grid locked, meaning more bad air pollution for people to breathe in.

I heard no new water reservoirs have been built for years and some local authorities are reducing the amount of water taken from the rivers, so where is the extra water demand going to come from, especially in a fairly dry year like this year? This also affects sewage, will our local water treatment plants be able to cope the extra demand? It could also mean more water pollution. We've already had a note from Affinity Water on how to conserve water. Electricity supply, coal power stations are due to be decommissioned, renewables are increasing but will they be enough to cover the extra demand, and Nuclear, the new power station is still years from being up and running?

Just food for thought, please take care of our environment.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2779  **Respondent:** 10705377 / Elizabeth Carr  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A22

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

My husband Lawson Carr and I, Elizabeth Carr am objecting to the increased number of houses proposed north of Keens Lane. We objected initially on the lower number and our objections still stand.

*140 and certainly 150 dwellings will add at least 300 residents, and that is a low estimate, the larger properties are likely to have 3 or 4 residents and at least 2 cars.*

- This will increase congestion on the surrounding, already congested, routes
- This will increase problems around any exit onto Keens Lane
- This will increase the footfall on Whitmoor Common, putting this protected area under more strain.

This will increase the potential accident rate on the blind corner on Keens Lane

This will decrease the evidence of wildlife, critical to our area - it is common to see deer, rabbits, and rare birds.

*Our house [Attachment redacted due to statements containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998] was purchased because it was semi-rural and we do not wish for any of the above certainties to come true should this plan go ahead.*

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7113  **Respondent:** 10712833 / Felicity O’Brien  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22
I believe that the local plan needs to be reviewed to reflect the number of housing units built in Guildford over the last 5 years.

The infrastructure in the area is unable to support a development on the Keens Lane site. The roundabout at the eastern end of Keens Lane is already dangerous as drivers locally treat this roundabout as a chicane.

Worplesdon Road is already one of the worst roads in the area for traffic congestion during rush hours.

Drainage – Any hardstanding from a development west of Findlay Drive will increase the run off into Sime Close and consequentially silting up of the soakaways.

Gravetts Lane was flooded on 23rd June after the rain the night before. The foul sewers were bubbling up with the need for a clean up to be carried out.

Gas & Electricity there is insufficient power in the area requiring an upgrade to the system.

Schools, Hospitals, Doctors, Dentists would all need to be improved to support another significant development as there are already availability and access issues with all of the above without exacerbating the issues further.

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

Attached documents:
My principal ground for objecting to the scheme is the considerable additional road traffic and consequent pollution which will be generated by the scheme and which will exacerbate what is already an unsustainable situation. In addition the present means of access to this area of land via Keens Lane and/or Tangley Lane is totally unsuitable being very narrow and in parts barely passable by two cars. In addition specific areas of the access roads are dangerous as there are blind spots which could easily lead to traffic collisions.

My husband and I have lived on the Keens Park development just off Keens Lane since 1983. We have brought up our two sons during that period and from 1983 to date have regularly travelled to and from Guildford town centre. I can therefore speak with considerable experience and knowledge gained over a period of 30 years of the problems encountered in driving to and from the town centre from this area and how further development cannot be sustained.

It is proposed that there should be 140 homes built on this site together with a 60 bed care home. It is noted that there has been an increase in the number of care home beds since the original proposal in 2014 of 50 beds.

1. The site as shown edged blue on the plan included with the Local Plan document does not give any indication of how access would be gained to the development. The boundary does not appear to be immediately adjacent to the A322 Worplesdon Road and the only roads bordering the site are Keens Lane and the Tangley Lane extension of Gravetts Lane. It is difficult to envisage what interventions the Highway Authority might have to undertake to enable access to the site. Keens Lane is for the most part barely passable by two cars, particularly the section immediately between the turning into what used to be Hones scrapyard and Keen Park Road. I have had my wing mirror shattered by a passing driver who did not slow down to take account of this narrow section and it requires two cars to pass slowly and with care or for one to give way to the other. It also narrows considerably immediately adjacent to the new development at Morgan Close/67 Keens Lane and there would not appear to be scope for widening at the point adjacent to the Findlay Drive/Sime Close intersections as there are existing houses on each side of the road. The narrowing of the road at this point also creates what is effectively a “blind bend”. Those of us who have lived in the area for many years instinctively slow down at this point as the lane is frequently used by horse riders, as indeed is Gravetts Lane. However, drivers who are not familiar with the road and these potential hazards frequently approach this area at speed and it is very likely an accident will occur. Indeed I have witnessed a horse rider who had either fallen off her horse at this point or been affected by a road traffic incident. If there are any large vehicles in the area such as refuse lorries, delivery vans, etc the road either becomes impassable or it may be necessary for cars to mount the pavement to get by. There is also only pavement on one side of Keens Lane. The Gravetts Lane/Tangle Lane extension leading from the mini-roundabout at the top of Gravetts Lane up Tangle Lane to the A322 is also very narrow and bendy with a blind bend immediately beyond the Riding Stables and no pavement after this point either. It would therefore be impossible for 140 homes to be accessed via Keens Lane or via the Gravetts Lane/Tangle Lane extension without considerable redevelopment of these roads and the possible compulsory acquisition of properties adjoining the road to make this possible. The Plan refers to one of the opportunities offered being “encourage cycling and pedestrian movements from the site”. Unless there are major improvements in the access roads mentioned above, i.e. Keens Lane, Tangle Lane and Gravetts Lane then the additional traffic generated by this development will make any form of cycling or pedestrian use particularly hazardous. Many children and their parents use these roads to access the primary school at Fairlands and I have often encountered parents cycling with their small children and attempting to shield them from cars travelling at high speed along these three roads. Cars are parked all along one side of Gravetts Lane adjacent to the houses and these create another “blind area” for vehicles approaching either from the Tangle Lane end or the Aldershot Road end as it is not always possible to see in time when a vehicle is approaching.

1. The 140 homes proposed for this site could potentially mean an additional 280 vehicles will be added to those presently using this part of the Borough. Considerable additional traffic will therefore be generated. If they do not access the proposed site via Keens Lane and/or Gravetts Lane/Tangle Lane they will be using these roads to gain access to the town centre via either the A322 Worplesdon Road or the A323 Aldershot Road. No Park and Ride facility exists on this side of Guildford town centre to alleviate the large number of cars using both the Worplesdon Road and the Aldershot Road and this would have constituted a far better use of this area of land rather than further housing development.
1. In addition to the proposed homes I note that there is to be a 60 bed care home. I do not know if this is intended to be a Council care home or a private home. You will be aware that we already have a 78 bed private care home, Worpleson View Care Home, run by Barchester Healthcare immediately adjacent to the proposed development. Is it necessary for another home to be sited immediately alongside this existing home? Within a very small radius of Keens Lane there are also other recently constructed private care homes, namely Claremont Court (57 beds) in Harts Gardens, and Queen Elizabeth Park (77 beds) at 1-72 Hallowes Close. A further 60 bed care home is also proposed at Normandy, Policy 46, under the Plan under consideration. Additional traffic will also be generated with residents’ visitors, emergency vehicles, doctors’ cars, staff and trade vehicles. Even allowing for the increase in the ageing population I do not consider it necessary to construct yet another home in this particular area with the consequent loss of the Green Belt land on which it is to be built.

1. In order to understand the complexity of the traffic situation as it presently is before any additional development has taken place I will explain how I am affected. I leave home during the week at approximately 8.20 am in order to go to work. As anyone who lives in the area knows once you turn out of Keens Lane onto the A322 the road to Guildford is generally already at a standstill at this time with the rush-hour traffic. Indeed you can wait several minutes before it is possible to even join the roundabout at this junction because of traffic already on the road, traffic joining from Cumberland Avenue and traffic coming from Guildford towards Worpleson. The situation has deteriorated steadily over the past 10-15 years and traffic has increased considerably with the development of the Queen Elizabeth Park. It is now so bad that I do not even attempt to take the A322 to Guildford but instead use the A323 Aldershot Road. The problem is alleviated in the Summer months when people are away on holiday and the schools have broken up but from September to early April the congestion is a daily occurrence and a 2.5 mile journey into Guildford Centre can on occasion take 45 minutes or longer. Should any additional incidents occur such as an accident on the A3 or the surrounding roads then complete gridlock ensues. In these circumstances it is virtually impossible to find any alternative route. Motorists will leave the A322 via Keens Lane/Gravetts Lane and also Shepherds Lane to join the Aldershot Road where a similar situation usually prevails. This is because both of these two major roads funnel into the Woodbridge Hill junction with the A3 at the Dennis Roundabout which creates a bottleneck for all traffic coming from the North side of Guildford. This is another reason why a Park and Ride facility should be seriously considered for North Guildford and/or improved public transport links.

1. My own journey to work in Guildford town centre is now undertaken via the A323 Aldershot Road. This is not simply because the A322 Worpleson Road is virtually at a standstill but because of the problems encountered with both the A322 and the A323 both funneling into the A3 at the Dennis Roundabout as mentioned above. When considering your journey to Guildford from the Worpleson/Fairlands side of the town this has to be borne in mind and as mentioned previously any incident on the A3 can result in total gridlock and chaos. This is either because traffic is unable to join the A3 heading South on the slip road thereby backing up into the Worpleson and Aldershot Roads or alternatively traffic may be forced to leave the A3 at the North bound slip road and divert through the town centre causing the same problem.

1. Gravetts Lane has become increasingly busy in recent years. At one time I could drive down this road in the early morning rush hour and not encounter one car coming the other way. However, with the additional traffic on the A322 and to some extent the developments at Morgan Close and Sime Close in Keens Lane the traffic has increased and you will now meet traffic coming in both directions. Many of these motorists are cutting through from the Worpleson Road to the Aldershot Road and vice versa. At certain times of the day cars are parked all along one side of Gravetts Lane and it is not always possible to see cars coming in the other direction before they are almost upon you. This adds to the danger to pedestrians and cyclists on the road particularly with small children using the road to go to school at Fairlands and horse riders also using the road at quieter times of the day.

1. When I turn out of Gravetts Lane onto the A323 at 8.20 am the traffic is at a complete standstill during the months from September to mid-April. It can take up to 20 minutes to reach the roundabout at Rydes Hill School where I turn off to continue my journey through Park Barn. This is a regular route taken by local motorists to avoid both the A322 and A323 traffic congestion. However, it is not a total answer to the problem because when you reach the Southway/Egerton Road roundabout traffic builds up coming down Park Barn Drive and entering from Southway and again there is congestion and delay. Many motorists now try to avoid this by diverting via Barnwood Road and Cabell Road in order to have the right of way at the Southway roundabout.
This all contributes to the danger to pedestrians in the area. There are two schools, namely Kings College secondary school and Guildford Grove Primary School in Park Barn so there are many children negotiating the immediate roads including mothers with pushchairs and small children. The road in front of Guildford Grove Primary School is frequently blocked by cars parked outside the shopping parade and outside the school and the use of Cabell Road/Southway as a “rat run” must make the likelihood of an accident far higher. In addition, the proximity of the Royal Surrey County Hospital means additional traffic heading for the hospital including emergency ambulances. There has been a slight improvement with the installation of the traffic lights outside the Royal Surrey County Hospital but it is not until this point is gained that any real progress can be made. My point in explaining all this in considerable detail is that the present situation of congestion on the A322 and A323 cannot be avoided merely by taking an alternative route from the North side of Guildford and the existing roads are already at saturation point.

1. The situation is no different when returning home in the evening during the rush-hour. If you take the shortest route out of Guildford town centre via Walnut Tree Close then you first of all have to negotiate the congestion immediately outside the station entrance where there is insufficient room for two cars to pass because parking is allowed outside the flats immediately beyond the station. During the winter months and early Spring traffic grinds to a halt well before the bend near Topp Tiles and you can sit in a jam here for at least 40 minutes waiting to reach the end of the road and gain access to the A3/Ladymead junction. Once caught in this jam there is no way out because of the confines of the River Wey and the railway line. Once you have reached the Ladymead junction it is virtually impossible to turn out into the traffic. Motorists take no notice of the yellow box junction and you have to push your way out into two stationary lines of traffic in order to head towards the A3 and the Wooden Bridge turn off to the A322. The route down Woodbridge Road is similarly busy and then funnels into the same congested two lanes.

1. If you choose to come into Guildford via the A320 Woking Road the same congestion occurs at the Stoke Road roundabout with two lanes of traffic turning right to join the A3/Ladymead bypass. Traffic coming from Woodbridge Hill towards Guildford and turning right into Woodbridge Road is also immediately reduced from two lanes at the traffic lights to one lane in Woodbridge Road (because of the bus lane). This has a further funnelling effect plus numerous incidents of road rage as drivers endeavour to push into the offside lane before the bus lane starts.

1. All of the above points need to be taken into account by the Highway Authority when considering these developments because most of the people living in these houses will require access to Guildford town centre for their work, shopping requirements, schools, hospital treatment, etc. I believe the situation is already worse than it was in 2014 when I previously objected to this proposed development. Other proposals in the new Plan for 1,150 houses at Normandy, Policies A46 and A47, can only make the situation intolerable.

1. Mention should also be made of the consequent considerable pollution arising from roads leading into Guildford being filled with stationary vehicles emitting noxious exhaust fumes. Are we seriously proposing to encourage cycling and pedestrian movements in this sort of environment and is this what we want for our children on their journeys to school? Residents in the Keens Lane/Gravetts Lane/Aldershot Road and Worplesdon Road areas will also be subject to months of heavy lorries, cement mixers, noise, traffic delays, pollution, dust and roads being dug up constantly for connection to services whilst these proposed areas are developed should the Council decide to proceed.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/389</th>
<th>Respondent: 10798049 / Steve &amp; Maureen Knight</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )</td>
<td>is Sound? ( )</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I support the inclusion of land off Keens Lane, Worplesdon (Site A22) in the GBC Draft Local Plan for the proposed development of 140 homes and a care home and believe this is appropriate for three main reasons:

1. The area is out of date Green Belt, which should have been rescheduled years ago. It is developed already and could be further developed with minimum local impact, particularly if some small amount of road widening is carried out as part of the project. Trying to protect all of the green belt is inappropriate in this case.

2. Keens Lane is already an urban road with good access to public transport and local schools and amenities in Fairlands and the Worplesdon Road.

3. The proposed development site is an unsightly (and smelly) brown field development that is inappropriate in the neighbourhood and could ease the housing shortage with minimal impact.

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

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6270</th>
<th>Respondent: 10823905 / Helen Baidya</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the inclusion of land off Keens Lane, Worplesdon (Site A22) in the GBC Draft Local Plan for the proposed development of 140 homes and a care home, it is totally inappropriate for many reasons including three reasons below:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. This area is a Green Belt area, and as such should be built on otherwise why would it be green belt and I understand that Surrey County Council has urged Guildford Borough Council to protect Green Belt land - how can you have such different views considering you are elected by and serving the same people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Keens Lane is a very narrow road - to get 2 small cars to pass each other means that both car need to pull over hitting the bushes/shrubs and usually one of the cars needing to stop. How would you expect 140 homes to access this lane safely, as most cars have at least 2 cars it would mean 280 negotiating the already congested lane leading into the constricted and congested and Gravetts Lane/Tangley Lane.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Whitmoor Common and a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and would have a damaging effect on ecology and wildlife. It is also bounded by Broadstreet Common. The open nature of Worplesdon should be retained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust you will consider my objections at your attempt to once again build in this special and protected area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3567</th>
<th>Respondent: 10833569 / Gary Parkin</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish to register my objection to the inclusion of land off Keens Lane, Worplesdon (Site A22) in the GBC Draft Local Plan for the proposed development of 140 homes and a care home and believe this is inappropriate for the following reasons:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Keens Lane is a narrow lane and has been so for decades, over which more and more houses have been snuck into the area feeding off of the narrow lane. Building more properties there without widening of the road does not seem logical and any widening and increased traffic would then severely impact on the interlinking, of Gravetts Lane and Tangle Lane.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The area is Green Belt, which should be retained and not built on, but then you know this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3749</th>
<th>Respondent: 10836641 / Peter Wilkinson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am writing to send an objection to development of land at Keens Lane for 140 homes, Site A.22 in the Local Plan.

1. The site should not be developed as it forms part of the Green Belt protected zone surrounding Guildford

2. Keens Lane is a very narrow lane, bordered on the one side by housing and common land, and on the other by tall hedges. In places it is impossible for two vehicles to pass each other. Tangle Lane, into which Keens Lane feeds, and which forms part of the boundary of the development, is equally narrow, and has a particularly hazardous blind 90 degree corner. Both lanes are unsuitable for further traffic.

3. Whitmoor Common SPA is adjacent to the corner of the proposed development, and with the nearby Broad Street Common SNCI, further housing development would create unacceptable stress on these unique protected habitats, and the wildlife corridor between them.

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

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/256  **Respondent:** 10838529 / Tracey Watson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22

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

- POLICY A22: Land north of Keens Lane, Guildford
  
  o I do not support the size of the site at the land north of Keens Lane, Guildford for the western end of this site heavily encroaches on the existing properties in Keens, Tangle and Gravetts Lane. I would support this site if it was reduced in size to address my concern.

  o I have concerns with the amount of traffic that will be created on Keens, Tangle and Gravetts Lane as a result of this site. All of those roads are very small and not designed for the increase that would result. The site would be better served by a single access road from the A322 Worplesdon Road and would support this site if this was the case.

  * I am grateful to see the removal of the sites at Liddington Hall and Fairlands as I did not support them in the previous local plan for numerous reasons.

Other than the points I have highlight I have no objection and support of rest of the local plan.

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

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2890  **Respondent:** 10877505 / Zenda Cater  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A22

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

---

**OBJECTION TO ADDITIONAL 10 HOUSES IN A22 OF PROPOSED LOCAL PLAN**

1. KEENS LANE
A LANE IS A NARROW ROAD

1. 10 ADDITIONAL HOUSES TO THE PROPOSED 140, MEANS 10 OR MORE EXTRA CARS AS MANY HOUSES HAVE 2 OR MORE VEHICLES WHICH COULD RESULT IN THREE HUNDRED OR MORE IN TOTAL.
2. ADDED TRAFFIC ON ALREADY CONGESTED ALDERSHOT AN WORPLESDON ROADS.
3. ADDED POLLUTION FROM TRAFFIC AND FUMES
4. THE NEARBY PONDS WHICH ARE INHABITED BY WILDLIFE COULD SUFFER.
5. LOCAL HEALTH SERVICES ARE ALREADY OVERSTRETCHED.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/5746  **Respondent:** 10880449 / Emma Holland  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22

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

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to object to the current plan for the development of Keens Lane.

Having moved to Tangley Lane 3 years ago with the purpose of living in peace and quiet with no street lights and little traffic I am very upset that this development has been proposed on green belt land which I assumed would be safe from development!

My first issue is we applied for planning permission for an extension which was initially turned down because of the impact on the green belt. I would like someone to explain how an extra metre on the side of my house was turned down but it is now ok to ruin a large greenbelt site for 140 houses opposite my house?

Secondly we regularly see Deer using this area passing from Whitmoor common, I’d like to understand what impact this will have on the local wildlife and what provisions have been put into place for them? We also have lots of Bats which I know are in the old stable buildings on this site, what will happen to them?

Finally the traffic on the Aldershot road as well the Worplesdon Road towards the town centre is already heavily congested in the mornings, adding additional traffic from here will make mornings harder for us all!!!

I hope these comments and objections are listened to?

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6140  **Respondent:** 10910529 / Kieran Michael  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
The fields off Keens Lane, in the Guildford Borough Council Draft Local Plan for the development of a care home plus 140 homes should be removed for the following reasons:

1. The area is Green Belt which must be protected because once you have built on the land it will be lost forever.
   1. It is a migration route for deer and they follow a path back and forward across the fields on a daily basis.
   3. Keens Lane is too narrow to support the extra traffic, it can be dangerous to drive down as it is.

1. The roads going into Guildford from this end of town are too narrow to support a bus lane and cannot support the extra traffic that the new homes would bring.

3. These new homes would be too close to Whitmoor Common which is a Site of Special Scientific Interest.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6763  Respondent: 10910529 / Kieran Michael  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The fields by Keens Lane/Tangley Lane/Gravetts Lane in the Guildford Borough Council Draft Local Plan for the development of a OAP home plus 140 homes should be removed from the development plan because.

1. The area is Green Belt and must be kept for future generations.

1. We see deer move across these fields every day and they need their habitat route to be kept safe.

1. Bats live in the field to the left of our house.

4. Keens Lane cannot support the extra cars, it is dangerous already.

1. The Aldershot Road is very dangerous already and has too many serious accidents as it is.

1. Traffic in Guildford is already a nightmare and cannot support the extra cars that will come with extra houses.

7. Whitmoor Common is a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and needs to be protected along with the other common land around Worplesdon.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3887  Respondent: 10919617 / Michael Siobhan  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
The development of a care home and the building of 140 homes on the fields off Keens Lane should be stopped because:

1. Once you have built on the land the fields will be lost forever, the area is Green Belt and therefore it must be protected.
2. A family of deer live and migrate across the field twice a day. You will therefore be destroying their habitat.
3. Keens Lane is narrow and dangerous to drive down at the moment without the added traffic that 140 houses will create.
4. This area is near Whitmoor Common, a site of Specific Scientific Interest.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5757  Respondent: 10921569 / Michelle Michael  Agent:

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

Objection to Site A22

The fields by Keens Lane, in the Guildford Borough Council Draft Local Plan for the development of a care home plus 140 homes should be removed for the following reasons:

1. The fields are Green Belt and must be protected because once you have built on the land there is no going back.
2. We have families of deer in the field and they follow a path back and forward across the field on a daily basis. It would be a great shame to lose this beautiful sight.
3. Keens Lane is too narrow to support the extra traffic, it’s already quite dangerous for our children to walk down going to get the school bus in the morning/afternoon so with extra traffic you could be looking at fatalities. Do you want this to happen!
4. The roads going into Guildford from this end of town are too narrow to support a bus lane and cannot support the extra traffic that the new homes would bring.
3. All these new houses would be too close to Whitmoor Common which is a Site of Special Scientific Interest.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6362  Respondent: 10931681 / Sally Harvey  Agent:

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

Traffic / infrastructure: Keens Lane is a very narrow lane. Many of the local residents park their vehicles on the street which makes two-way traffic impossible. Adding more homes in this area, quite frankly, is waiting for an
accident (possibly fatal) to happen. There is a serious blind spot (at the small hump which makes a bend in the road in Keens Lane, just before approaching the tiny roundabout at the junction of the end of Keens Lane and Gravetts Lane). I have personally been involved in a bad near-miss situation with oncoming traffic (in the dark Winter hours), and have witnessed others in the same predicament. It is sheer madness to burden this area further with increased traffic.

1. Greenbelt: this space is protected land (according to the UK Government) so why is anyone considering building on it? If we keep "chipping away" at our greenbelt, it will be like removing bricks from a wall, one at a time. One day, there will be NO WALL left. Please please please protect this land from development, for the sake of wildlife and humans alike.

1. Flooding: once again, the subject of local flooding arises. If you build on open land, you remove the ability for the surrounding land to be resilient to flooding. Surely everyone can recognize this from the increased stories of Winter / early Spring floods throughout the country? In the Fenn Lands of Cambridgeshire they have come to their senses and realized the only way to control local flooding was to return land to its original state - a FENN (open land) soaks up excess water which PROTECTS human homes from being flooded!! They have also realized this in certain areas of London. Isn't it about time GBC learned the lesson too, before you sentence all our homes to deluges and costly repair?

I would respectfully ask and urge GBC not to pass the proposed development (please.....). Thank you.

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

Attached documents:
This email is to signify that I object to the draft plan for the development of 140 homes and a care home on Site A22. The land is Green Belt and cannot be built on; as a community we must strive to protect the land around us - untouched fields such as these are part of Guildford's beauty. The fields are also a migration route for deer who pass on a daily basis.

In addition to this, the development is extremely close to Whitmoor common - a site of particular scientific Interest.

Furthermore, extra traffic in this area of Guildford would be dangerous - the roads are simply far too narrow to accommodate more cars.

I ask that you please take this into consideration. Should any developments take place it would completely destroy the area in which we live.

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

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1148</th>
<th>Respondent: 15272929 / roger kendall</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We object to any form of building on our green belt, especially the building of 140 new homes, and a care home. The issue's raised about the park and ride in previous years are still the same. We cannot withstand any more traffic on our small roads, pollution, light pollution, increase noise, over crowded schools, surgeries. Our infrastructure can not cope. Why do you want to ruin what lovely outlook our houses have? Please read my objection, as I feel very strongly about this, we deserve a say in what is planned for our green belt. We need to protect it. We say No No No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1163</th>
<th>Respondent: 15274977 / Robert Hilton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This level of building is totally unsuitable to an area where the roads are presently inadequate and is far to close to the SSI besides the loss of green belt separation between towns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5921</th>
<th>Respondent: 15276385 / Anna Szyniszewska</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough school places!!!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having lived near that area only last year, I can tell you (as if you need telling), that there are not enough primary school places. We lived on Cumberland Avenue and my son got offered his 14th closest school.........in Woking!!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You know there are not enough so what have you done about it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I would like to raise strong objection to the proposed plan A22. Keens Park residents are outraged and very worried about the plan to include more houses in an area which already struggles with poor and deteriorated road infrastructure and lack of playground for local children. Aldershot Road and Worplesdon Road surrounding our community experience already very heavy traffic during rush hours. Northern part of the Worplesdon Road is very busy and narrow and dangerous for both cars and pedestrians. Keens Park area has very limited parking space, roads are very narrow and will not be able to cope with additional 140 homes. Also, in the current development there is no single playground. The only playground in this area is located in Queen Elisabeth Park, and in order to go there children need to cross dangerous round-about, or walk along very busy Worplesdon Road on a very narrow sidewalk. Finally, that playground even doesn't include basic equipment to play for under 3 year olds, apart from swings.

Should the houses be built, it is imperative to plan for:

- robust enhancement of local roads (Keens Lane, Worplesdon Rd)
- include significant recreation space for local residents including playground
- space for local shops

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

Attached documents:
Site A22

I strongly object to the inclusion of land off Keens Lane, bordered by Tangley lane Worplesdon (Site A22) in the GBC Draft Local Plan for the proposed development of 140 homes and a care home and believe this is inappropriate for three main reasons:

1. The area is Green Belt, which should be retained and not built Surrey County Council is historically the creator of the Green Belt and has previously agreed to use its power to protect Surrey's Green Belt and to support the National Planning Policy Framework (section 9- paragraphs 79 to 92) and the Government's policy of protecting the Green Belt and that any Green Belt development in the County is in line with the needs and wishes of Surrey residents. I can't say I have heard any Surrey residents advocating the development of Greenbelt land. Indeed there is a feeling of anger locally that this should even be considered. This point alone should be sufficient to remove this site from the local plan.

1. Keens Lane is a narrow lane as is Tangley lane which borders the site, parts of these lanes are little more than single track, prone to flooding and used widely by walkers and horse To increase traffic levels will potentially endanger human life which must be deemed a risk one should not take and I wish to object on the grounds of road and infrastructure and traffic pressures.

2. The proposed development site is close to Whitmoor on and a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and would have a damaging effect on ecology and wildlife. It is also bounded by Broadstreet Common. The open nature of Worplesdon should be retained. The land is part of the important wildlife corridor between Whitmoor and Broadstreet Commons. As such, developing the site would conflict with NPPF paras 113, 117, 118, and 119. Historical previous applications in the area have been turned down by the inspectorate for the following reasons:

"The proposed development, in my opinion, would further impair the efficiency of both the A323 and A322 which, as principal roads connecting Guildford to the M3 and the major growth area, must be safeguarded .......".

In 1983, the County Engineer wrote to the then MP concerning the Surrey Structure Plan:

"Accordingly the County Council as Highway Authority will seek to prevent the grant of any planning permission which would significantly increase traffic to the south of Liddington Hall". In 1985, in spite of the above, an attempt was made by the County Council to build on Uddington Hall Farm, which at that time they owned. The Inspector recommended: "In my judgement, the discharge to A322/A323 of traffic from 700 dwellings additional to that arising from expected development at Tilehouse, Stoughton and from general growth of traffic would add unacceptably to prevailing congestion and danger on the main framework roads."

In 2003, the Officer Report to the Executive on the Deposit Draft Surrey Structure Plan 2002 stated:

"The findings thus far suggest that the transport impacts associated with the north west community [the Liddington Hall site] would be significant and difficult to resolve."

With traffic levels seemingly ever increasing, these reasons for not including this site are even more relevant today and I wish to include them in my objection.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2288  Respondent: 15383937 / Laurence White  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I strongly object to the inclusion of land off Keens Lane, Worplesdon (Site A22) in the GBC Draft Local Plan for the proposed development of 140 homes and a care home and believe this is inappropriate for three main reasons:

1. The area is Green Belt and therefore should be retained as per guidance from Surrey County Council. This reason alone should be sufficient.
2. Keens Lane and Tangley lane are narrow lanes with no passing places, prone to flooding and are regularly used by walkers, joggers and horseriders. They are little more than single track with no passing. Any further increase in traffic could endanger these users and inflict misery on the local residents.
3. The proposed development site is close to Whitmoor Common and a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and would have a damaging effect on ecology and the local wildlife. The proposed site is also bordered by Broadstreet Common. As such, developing the site would conflict with NPPF paras 113, 117, 118, and 119.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2923  Respondent: 15383937 / Laurence White  Agent:

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

I strongly object to the inclusion of land off Keens Lane, Worplesdon (Site A22) in the GBC Draft Local Plan for the proposed development of 140 homes and a care home and believe this is inappropriate for three main reasons:

1. The area is Green Belt, which should be retained.
2. Traffic Keens Lane and Tangley lane are narrow lanes with no passing places, prone to flooding and are regularly used by walkers, joggers and horseriders. They are little more than single track with no passing. Any further increase in traffic could endanger these users and inflict misery on the local residents. I object on the grounds of it being greenbelt, increased traffic & infrastructure as per my objection to the Keens Lane development in the draft plan and there are no exceptional circumstances to be applied to this application.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2297  Respondent: 15384161 / Laura Dawson  Agent:

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

I strongly object to the inclusion of land off Keens Lane, Worplesdon (Site A22) in the GBC Draft Local Plan for the proposed development of 140 homes and a care home and believe this is inappropriate for three main reasons:

1. The area is Green Belt, which should be retained.
2. Traffic Keens Lane and Tangley lane are narrow lanes with no passing places, prone to flooding and are regularly used by walkers, joggers and horseriders. As a horse rider myself I appreciate that any further increase in traffic could endanger the public and horses alike.
3. The proposed development site is close to Whitmoor Common and a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and would have a damaging effect on ecology and wildlife. It is also bounded by Broadstreet Common. The open...
nature of Worplesdon should be retained. The land is part of the important wildlife corridor between Whitmoor and Broadstreet. As such, developing the site would conflict with NPPF paras 113, 117, 118, and 119.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2924  Respondent: 15384161 / Laura Dawson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A22

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

Site A 22

I strongly object to the increased housing numbers on the land off Keens Lane, and believe this is inappropriate for three main reasons:

1. The area is Green Belt, which should be retained.
2. Traffic. Keens Lane and Tangley lane are narrow lanes and already bottleneck onto busy Worplesdon Road and Aldershot Road via Gravett's lane. Parts of these lanes are little more than single track and used widely by walkers and horse riders. As a horse rider myself I appreciate that any further increase in traffic could endanger the public and horses alike.
3. The proposed development site is close to Whitmoor Common and a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and would have a damaging effect on ecology and wildlife. It is also bordered by Broadstreet Common. The open nature of Worplesdon should be retained. The land is part of the important wildlife corridor between Whitmoor and Broadstreet Commons. As such, developing the site would conflict with NPPF paras 113, 117, 118, and 119.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2299  Respondent: 15384449 / Christine Adams  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22

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

Site A 22

I strongly object to the inclusion of land off Keens Lane, Worplesdon (Site A22) in the GBC Draft Local Plan for the proposed development of 140 homes and a care home and believe this is inappropriate for three main reasons:

1. The area is Green Belt and therefore should be retained as per guidance from Surrey County. This reason alone should be sufficient.
2. Keens Lane and Tangley lane are narrow lanes. Parts of these lanes which are regularly used by walkers, joggers, and horse riders are little more than single track with no passing. Any further increase in traffic could endanger these users.
3. The proposed development site is close to Whitmoor Common and a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and would have a damaging effect on ecology and wildlife. It is also bordered by Broadstreet Common. The open nature of Worplesdon should be retained. The land is part of the important wildlife corridor between Whitmoor and Broadstreet Commons. As such, developing the site would conflict with NPPF paras 113, 117, 118, and 119.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPS16/3292  Respondent: 15446465 / Claudette Keane  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22

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

My name is Claudette Keane I am a resident at [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998]

I am writing to register my objection to the proposed developments on Keens Lane and its surroundings.

Should the need for this development be reviewed in the light of the Brexit vote.

Why use GREEN BELT land when its gone its gone .

The proximity to Whitmore common adversely affects wild life.

Keens Lane is too narrow to widen .

What will happen to the 16th century property on the north side of the road .

The traffic in this area is a nightmare at rush hours .

The drainage and sewerage services currently in place cannot cope when there is heavy rain .

Some close gets flooded every time there is heavy rain.

Parking is a nightmare ,we are forced to drive on the wrong side of the road as people have no where else except on the main road.

Current essential service’s such as Gas, Electric ,Schools ,Hospitals doctor’s etc. are at breaking point.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5872  Respondent: 15576513 / Stefan Szyniszewski  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A22

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

I am writing to express my objection to the construction of additional 140 homes on the land north of Keens Lane (A22 site location). Before construction of new homes can be considered, there is an urgent need to prepare public infrastructure for additional cars on the roads, upgrade the drainage system for the increased water demand, as well as to ensure that a local school can accommodate extra pupils and local surgeries can handle additional number of patients.

Firstly, local roads, roundabouts and parking spaces need to be upgraded before any new homes are constructed. Such upgrades are only practical before new construction as they are almost impossible after the road layout is limited by fencing of the new homes. The list of road upgrades needed to enable A22 development is substantial, to name just a few:
Road widening is urgently required on Worplesdon Rd between Keens Ln toward Worplesdon. An extra lane of traffic could be constructed at the expense of the green field to the left of the road. Such widening will not be possible after new homes are built.

(3) Roundabout improvement will also be needed. Currently, it's hard to enter Worplesdon Rd as there is limited visibility of the traffic leaving Guildford toward Worplesdon. This roundabout will almost certainly become a traffic bottleneck after the addition of 140 new homes.

Roundabout at the intersection of Keens Ln and Worplesdon Rd.

(4) The roads are overloaded and deteriorate quickly. The additional 140 homes x 2 cars per family = 280 extra cars on the road will not help.

Fig. 2. Crumbling roads, Keens Ln and Cranstoun Close shown.

(5) There is a lack of parking spaces. Again, it is not clear if additional 280 cars will improve the parking situation.

Secondly, significant intrusion into the green belt and removal of green space will have an adverse impact on the access and civic enjoyment of local amenities. Currently in the area of Worplesdon Road north of Shepperd Road and Queen Elizabeth park inclusive there is only one recreation area that includes a playground. Not only this is way too little, but the facilities in the playground do not include gear for children less than 3 years old. In addition to the improved road infrastructure, recreation space, playground, secondary school and a nursery shall be considered and included in the local plan.

Finally, we oppose adding approximately 6,900 new homes across Guildford (as proposed in the plan). Currently there are about 66k residents in Guildford, and if we assume there are on average three residents per house it means there is a total of about 22k houses in Guildford as of now. Adding nearly 7k new homes will cause at least a 30% increase in the population number, possibly higher. Guildford is already struggling with traffic, and the quality of life and attractiveness of this place will deteriorate, without any matching investment in public amenities and roads. Only several projects on the long proposed list should be funded. It is prudent to complete selected projects first and to assess their impact before commencing additional construction.

In summary, it is not a feasible plan to construct a massive number of new homes without any substantial public works, such as for example: (i) road widening of Worplesdon Rd, (ii) road widening of Keens Ln, (iii) creation of addition parking spaces, (iv) planning for an additional secondary school and a GP surgery.

Please note attached photos

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

Attached documents: A22 pics.doc (144 KB)
I strongly object to the extra proposed houses on the A22 Keen’s Lane site as I did earlier plans.

1. There will be no corridor for wild life.
2. The main roads are already grid locked.
3. The local lanes are already getting dangerous with the already mounted traffic.
4. The doctor’s surgeries are now stretched to the limits as waiting time to see a doctor is getting longer.

This site falls outside of Thames Water’s water supply boundary.

We have concerns regarding Wastewater Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.

The proposed 140 dwellings and 60 bed care home exceed the capacity trigger levels for available network. Developer funded impact study required to understand implications of development.
Policy A22: Land North of Keens Lane, Guildford

Part of this site is within 400m of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. Whilst the policy makes reference to a care home being allocated within the 400m exclusion zone, it must be ensured that future residents will be too infirm and/or have reduced mobility making it unlikely that they will be able to recreate on the SPA.

This policy also states that 150 residential units are proposed. It must be ensured that these units are located outside of the 400m exclusion zone and must provide an appropriate suite of mitigation to ensure that impacts upon the SPA are avoided.

This site allocation is in very close proximity to the Whitmoor Common SSSI. Any direct or indirect impacts on this site should also be avoided or mitigated.

I object in the strongest possible terms to the following policies within the Draft Local Plan:

Policy A22 - Land North of Keens Lane

Policy A26 - Blackwell Farm

I do not believe that constraints have been properly applied to the Draft Local Plan in terms of the AONB, SPA/SSSI of Whitmoor Common, Green Belt, transport implications, flooding from surface water, lack of infrastructure, vehicular emissions and the proposed use of high grade agricultural land in accordance with paragraphs 112, 119 and 166 of the NPPF.

The SHMA numbers used by G L Hearn appear to be inflated due to discrepancies in the student numbers. This vital piece of the Evidence base appears to be fundamentally flawed.

Guildford is being targeted as a growth hub, but due to the town's topography and the numerous planning constraints which should, but have not been applied, I do not consider the proposed plan to be sound.

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

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Water Response</th>
<th>Waste Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42327</td>
<td>A22 - Land north of Keens Lane, Guildford</td>
<td>This site falls outside of Thames Water’s water supply boundary.</td>
<td>The wastewater network capacity in this area may be unable to support the demand anticipated from this development. Local upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are may be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a potential wastewater network capacity constraint, the developer should liaise with Thames Water to determine whether a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered is required. The detailed drainage strategy should be submitted with the planning application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Attached documents:
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A23 - Land north of Salt Box Road, Guildford
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8279  Respondent: 8591041 / Surrey Wildlife Trust (Mike Waite)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A23

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

Within BOA TBH04 Ash, Brookwood & Whitmoor Heaths, with the Thames Basin Heaths SPA/Whitmoor Common SSSI adjacent. Change of use should assist achievement of BOA objectives (inc. restoration/creation of Priority habitats, inc. Heathland and Acid grassland).

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7702  Respondent: 8591073 / Connectivity Associates Ltd (Mike Gibson)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A23

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

Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2016 Policy A23: Land north of Salt Box Road, Guildford

On behalf of the owners of this site, I am writing to support the removal of this site from the Green Belt and its allocation for a Burial Ground, together with a new site access and appropriate supporting facilities, in the proposed submission Local Plan, to confirm that I have made representations via the Council’s on-line consultation, and to request that the following information be taken into account by the Council when approving the Local Plan for submission to the Secretary of State.

Our case in support of this allocation is set out below under the following headings:

1. The site and its ownership
2. Removal of the land from the Green Belt
3. Allocation for development
4. Ecological impact
5. Summary

1. The site and its ownership

The site is wholly owned by my clients, Hazel Rosemary Farris and Maureen Elizabeth Trotter, whom I represent and on whose behalf this letter and my on-line representations are made.

The site, with an area of 7.88 ha (19.5 acres), is a level area of improved grassland, situated on the north side of Salt Box Road, immediately to the north of the built-up area of Guildford. The site was previously used for the rearing of pigs, but since the 1970’s has been used for the grazing of domestic horses and the original farm buildings at the eastern end of the site are now in a derelict condition. Existing access is from Salt Box Road by way of a service road at the extreme eastern end of the site. This road also serves a mixed residential and commercial area, lying between the site and the...
railway line. To the north and west the site adjoins the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area, the mature trees of which form a readily recognisable boundary.

Salt Box Road links with the A322 (Worplesdon Road) to the west and with the A320 (Woking Road) to the east and both these roads enjoy good connections with the principal traffic route of the A3 to the south. There is convenient access for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists to the Guildford urban area to the south and footpaths and cycleways provide a convenient route to Worplesdon railway station, some 2k to the north. Bus services, operating along the A322 (to the west), the A320 (to the east) and Grange Road (to the south), are convenient to the site.

The site is level, is not at risk of flooding (being within Flood Zone 1), is easily and conveniently accessible by all modes of transport and is readily and immediately available for development.

2. Removal of the land from the Green Belt

The Local Plan’s proposal to remove the land from the Green Belt in order to meet future needs is supported.

The site is not within the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area or within any Sites of Special Scientific Interest, so the presumption against development applies only to its current Green Belt status.

The work that the Council has undertaken in the preparation of the proposed submission Local Plan has demonstrated that there will be insufficient land within the current built-up area to meet future needs over the next 20 years and that land for development will need to be taken out of the Green Belt to meet these needs.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) of March 2012 sets out the following policy approach to drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries. At paragraph 84 it says that local authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development, and at paragraph 85 it asks local authorities to (among others):

- Ensure consistency with the Local Plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development;
- Not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open;
- Satisfy themselves that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period; and
- Define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent.

Having regard to this national policy, I make the following propositions in respect of the land at Salt Box Road:

- The site is in a sustainable location, being immediately adjacent to the built-up area of Guildford, close to residential and employment development, conveniently served by the A320 and the A322 (both of which have good southward connections to the A3) and bus services and within reasonable distance from Guildford and Worplesdon railway stations, the latter by attractive pedestrian routes and cycleways;
- The development of the site as a burial ground would constitute a logical northward extension to the built-up area of Guildford;
- The site is not within the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area or within any Sites of Special Scientific Interest, so there would be no objection to the development of the site as a matter of principle;
- The site would help to satisfy the Borough’s need for burial ground land over the plan period (and beyond) in a sustainable way;
- There is no need or reason why the land should be kept permanently open; and
- The boundary of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (marked, in particular, by a line of mature oak trees around the site) would be a more logical and recognisable boundary to the Green Belt, particularly since the constraints to development of this protected area would ensure that the boundary would be permanent and accord with national policy on defining Green Belt boundaries.

3. Allocation for development
The Council needs land for burial ground purposes to meet future requirements. The land at Salt Box Road will help the Borough to meet these needs in a sustainable way. The allocation of the site under Policy A23 for a burial ground with a new site access and appropriate supporting facilities is therefore supported.

The development of the site for burial ground purposes would be appropriate here, given the proximity of residential development and the accessibility of the site. Moreover, it would not, in principle, be harmful to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area and would not be ruled out by the Avoidance Strategy.

Having regard to the Council’s allocation of the site for burial ground purposes under Policy A23, I make the following propositions:

- The site is an ideal one for burial ground purposes, being in a sustainable location, immediately adjacent to the built-up area of Guildford, close to residential development, conveniently served by the A320 and the A322 (both of which have good southward connections to the A3) and bus services and within reasonable distance from Guildford and Worplesdon railway stations, the latter by attractive pedestrian routes and cycleways;
- The site has an existing access from Salt Box Road via a service road at its eastern end. Whilst this could provide a secondary or emergency access, a more suitable access can be provided using the existing traffic light-controlled junction of Salt Box Road with Grange Road at the southern edge of the site. A photograph showing this potential access is appended to this letter;
- The allocation of the site as proposed under Policy A23 would assist in meeting anticipated needs for burial ground purposes over the plan period (and beyond); and
- The site is wholly owned by my clients and available for development

4. Ecological impact

Policy A23 states a requirement for a Habitat Regulations Assessment in connection with a future planning application.

A Phase 1 Habitat Survey has been undertaken to assess the likely impact of development on the ecology. The report of the survey and its findings were submitted with my earlier representations letter of 18 September 2014. The report concludes that the development of the site will be able to mitigate and compensate for all protected species and habitats found on site as long as the correct procedures are followed.

There can therefore be no justifiable objection to the proposed allocation of the site for burial ground purposes on grounds of ecological harm.

5. Summary

We support the removal of the site from the Green Belt and the allocation of the site for burial ground purposes under Policy A23 and we ask that what is said above is taken into account when approving the Local Plan for submission to the Secretary of State.

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

Attached documents:  grange.jpg  (257 KB)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4527</th>
<th>Respondent: 8627393 / Worpsdon Parish Council (Gaynor White)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( , is Sound? ( ) , is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| A23 | Land north of Salt Box Road – Allocated as a burial ground | Support subject to full infrastructure improvements being provided to allow safe access for all users. Concern about access both vehicular and pedestrian. Proximity to Britten’s Pond, which forms part of the ordinary watercourse leading to the River Wey from which drinking water is abstracted. The suitability of the site is for the Env. Agency to decide. Worplesdon Parish Council objects to the proposed relocation of the urban boundary at this point as it is not necessary to facilitate a cemetery in accordance with para 89 of the NPPF. |

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

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1176</th>
<th>Respondent: 8737697 / Hazel Farris</th>
<th>Agent: Connectivity Associates Ltd (Mike Gibson)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( Yes ), is Sound? ( Yes ), is Legally Compliant? ( Yes )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support the removal of this site from the Green Belt and its allocation for burial ground purposes.

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

**Attached documents:**

- 160718 LPA CAM034.pdf (1.8 MB)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/8220</th>
<th>Respondent: 8826529 / Martin Barker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site 65. Land north of Salt Box Road. Secondary School.

It is extraordinary that this site is even being considered for development as a school. Whilst I do not doubt that an additional school is required, this site is totally inappropriate. Why not use site 46 the former Pond Meadow School?

The site is within 400m of Whitmoor Common which forms part of the Thames Basin Heath, Special Protection Area (TBHSPA), Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Local Nature Reserve (LNR). Therefore it is protected by European Legislation. In terms of the Borough Council’s own policy no development should take place on this site. Regardless of any review of the Borough Council’s SPA Avoidance Strategy this site is inappropriate for development of any kind.
Salt Box Road is a busy rural “C” road. There are currently no footpaths along Salt Box Road. Pedestrians invariably have to walk in the road due to trees/shrubs growing right up to the kerb.

There is a low bridge (being the main Portsmouth/Waterloo line) near Mount Pleasant. It is extremely difficult and dangerous for pedestrians/equestrians wishing to pass underneath the railway bridge. Any increase in commercial or non-commercial traffic would exacerbate the current situation. There have been a number of personal injury accidents at the bridge.

There is a known surface water flooding “wet spot” beneath the railway bridge as recognised by Surrey County Council within their Flood Risk Strategy. If the bridge were to be lowered it would increase the risk of ponding beneath the bridge with associated issues for pedestrian access and black ice – made worse by the road bending at this point.

Traffic approaching from the Woking Road (A320) direction would be blind to commercial and other vehicles entering/ exiting the development until they have passed under the railway bridge. This would push delivery lorries onto adjacent rural roads where a number of fatal accidents have occurred (Burdenshott Road/Goose Rye Road/The Avenue).

Public bridleway (PB) no: 434 crosses Salt Box Road to the western side of the railway line and continues up Mount Pleasant. Any increase in traffic would have a detrimental impact on equestrians and pedestrians using Public Bridleway 434.

There is no street lighting along Salt Box Road. Given that Salt Box Road runs along the edge of Whitmoor Common SPA/SSSI street lighting would be inappropriate as it would create light pollution.

Existing traffic issues in Grange Road and Salt Box Road would be made worse.

This site forms part of a vital wildlife corridor linking Whitmoor Common SPA, SSSI, Chitty’s Common, Rydes Hill Common, Littlefield Common (SNCI), Broad Street and Backside commons (SNCI) to the Hogs Back AONB – paras 113, 117, 118 and 119 of the NPPF refer.

Noise is known to have a detrimental impact on the rare ground nesting birds that inhabit the Common (RSPB). The increase in traffic generated by the school run would be considerable.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6895  Respondent: 8878689 / E McShee  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A23  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )  
Policy A23 (Page 173) - Land North of Salt Box Road, Guildford.  
I support the use of this land as a burial ground with the appropriate supporting facilities with new site access and car parking.  
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?  
Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6118  Respondent: 8894657 / Jacob's Well Residents' Association (Janet Smith)  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A23  
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I support this development subject to suitable arrangements for parking and suitability of the site on environmental grounds.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6676  Respondent: 8974177 / Nigel Mitchell  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A23

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

Support

Whilst supporting this proposal it is not necessary to move the urban boundary to allow this development to happen.

The location requires significant improvements to the local infrastructure including safe access for all users of the burial ground including pedestrian access and changes to the traffic signalling.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3952  Respondent: 10543777 / Gordon Fullick  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A23

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

We wish to object to the land North of Saltbox Road being developed as a burial ground. The site is within the Green Belt and is bordered almost entirely by protected areas of Whitmoor Common including a SPA. We do not feel that Guildford Borough Council has proved beyond any doubt that this site must be developed as a burial ground. There is enough burial space for all who want it (for 40 years) within the parish of Worplesdon at St. Mary’s Church, Brookwood Cemetery offers a burial 10 anybody who lived within 17 miles of the Cemetery and there is a natural burial site at Clandon (Mole Valley Council use this for their residents). There are crematoria in Guildford (to be refurbished as 72% of the people of this country opt for cremation) and Woking. Godalming Borough Council has offered Guildford residents burial space (enough for many years) at Eashing Cemetery which is approximately the same distance from the centre of Guildford as Guildford Crematorium. The signage and lighting and the considerable building work (see below)would conflict with the openness of the Green Belt and the wild life would suffer through noise and light pollution (there would be lights for the offices, and ceremony room, to deal with unsocial behaviour and facilitate grave digging). Deer have been seen grazing on the site now that the horses have moved away and bats have been reported there.

If you refer to our local Ordnance Survey map you will see from the contours that the site has a considerable slope from from Mount Pleasant (45 AOD) down to Saltbox

Road (41 AOD). This slope is not mentioned in the report prepared for the owners of the site. (Please refer to your “get involved” website.) This is very obvious from our lounge, dining room and bedroom windows and our back garden. We
can see most of the field despite a six foot fence/wall around our garden. The field is bordered by a natural deciduous hedge and trees.

If you refer to the Environment Agency map (which is Appendix 0 Risk of Ground Water Flooding on your website) you will see that the area around and within our garden and down towards the railway bridge (including the triangle of common land at the lower right-hand boundary of the site which flanks the road leading UIJ to Mount Pleasant) is at risk of severe surface water flooding. Our garage which is close the Southside of Saltbox Road floods regularly. We are told this is surface water run-off from the surrounding areas! The tenants who rented "the horsefield" for grazing for 25 years say that the site floods (This is recorded on your get involved website). There is also an attenuation water course which runs under Saltbox Road to Brittens Pond which is very close to this site.

The site would require a car park (despite your remarks) as all average between 40 and 80 people attend a burial (more for natural burials which must be catered for and for some religions when the whole ceremony has be held by the grave). Parking all Saltbox Road is forbidden. Parking is not allowed on our grass verges as these are sights plays because of the dangerous bend and camber of the road and it was Highways Authority planning condition that they must not be obstructed. Parking inside Saltbox Cottages, an unadapted road without invitation is trespassing. The road UP towards Mount Pleasant is narrow. Grange Road already has a major problem with on-street parking and Cumberland Avenue is sometimes impassable by buses because of parking. Public transport is limited and walking from the Britten's Pond carpark or Saltbox Road carpark would encourage mourners (often elderly) to walk in the road and under the railway bridge which is dangerous. There are no residential roads that can lake the excess parking as there are near Stoke cemetery. There would be a large ceremony room (or perhaps several because 10 comply with the law it would be a multi-faith site) plus a waiting room, toilet facilities, gatehouse, storage and offices. We worry that this amount of building and the graves themselves would cause obstruction to the natural drainage process through the grass and it would increase our flooding and the "wetspot" under the railway bridge would flood frequently closing the road to traffic as has happened on many occasions in the past. We fear contaminated "grey" water would drain on our property and the SPA. Our water supply enters the property car our gale on Saltbox Road. The carpark would encourage dogwalkers onto Whitmoor Common as the gate of the burial ground would be open from dawn to dusk 364 days a year and despite the remarks in the draft plan we fail to see how cars entering the site could be checked for dogs or people stopped when leaving through the gate with a dog on a lead!!! Increased damage to the heath land, SPA and wild life would be inevitable. All the building materials and equipment would come past Whitmoor Common because the railway bridge furtherdown Saltbox Road is too low for larger HGVs which frequently get stuck (despite signage) and cause disruption to the traffic.

The cross roads and pedestrian crossing would be car the dangerous bend in the road and would cause more congestion. There is no public transport along Saltbox Road and no pavements as the road is bordered by common land. Nobody knows how much traffic will be generated by the 1,000 houses, the primary school and the increased business opportunities in the Slyfield area and even if the CLLR is built many of the vehicles from there will travel along Saltbox Road on their way to and from l3agshot and beyond and schools and work on the other side of the Worpleson Road and vice versa. This together with potential building at Keens Lane, Merrist Wood and Tangle Lane can only add to the problem. Salt box Road is approximately one mile long with a roundabout at each end and traffic lights in the middle. In the rush hours and at many times during the day the traffic struggles to negotiate the roundabouts resulting in traffic jams in both directions outside our gate which spread onto the Waking Road, Worpleson Road and Grange Road. The northern ring road is not and will not be a thing of the past so please do not make it worse! We call no longer sit in our back garden which borders Saltbox Road (less than three meters from our fence) because of the fumes from the stationary traffic, the rattling of the HGYs and the noise from car radios. It is impossible to hold a conversation. The only respite we get is about three hours in the middle of Christmas Day. The cumulative increase in traffic will overwhelm Saltbox Road,(which was congested before Queen Elizabeth Park was developed) Worpleson and us. The Campaign to Protect Rural England reports that developments in Mayford will also impact on Saltbox Road which is a C road "under stress". Any development on this site particularly involving public access would be disastrous for many reasons and it should be retained as grazing land or added to the common.

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

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/1579  Respondent: 10783777 / Neil Adams  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A23

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

I object to the moving of the Urban Boundary to encompass the site for the new Burial Ground north of Salt Box road. As far as I understand you do not need to change the Status of the Land from Green Belt to Urban for a Cemetery. It is lawful to place a Cemetery on Green Belt, therefore there is no need to go to the cost of altering the Land’s Status.

If I have misunderstood, please confirm back to me.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/390  Respondent: 10798049 / Steve & Maureen Knight  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A23

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

Object – concerns over access, traffic flow on Saltbox Road and the underlying water table

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/519  Respondent: 15194657 / Allan Spencer  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A23

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

I am writing to object to the proposed location of a Crematorium at Area A23 on Salt Box Road.

My house at [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998] is located on high ground at a distance of some half mile from the proposed site of the Crematorium.

My house, due to its elevated location, already suffers at infrequent intervals from air pollution from burning plastics, otherwise known as dioxins. I am currently attempting to establish the source of these. The most recent such occurrence was over the night of 16/17th June 2016.

In the meantime my objection to the crematorium is that Crematoria exhaust smells of burning flesh and there is potential for such smell to linger in the atmosphere at the elevated position of my property.

As a general rule I would have thought that the location of Crematoria should be between population centres and not on the edge of a large population density.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Sound like a good idea

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1162  Respondent: 15275169 / Eduardo Legname  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A23
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There is widespread anger within our community due to the intention to erect a burial ground (crematorium) in shocking proximity to our Stoughton/QEP area due to the following concerns

1) Health and environmental issues
2) Housing value
3) Traffic congestion.

The studies of the negative impact of crematoriums in local health is well documented. The area is permanently affected by traffic jams that will be worsened. Both conditions will lead to a negative drop in our life quality and properties values, among several other concerns.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5877  Respondent: 15275169 / Eduardo Legname  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A23
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The local community is firmly opposed to the erection of a burial grounds of any kind within the proposed A23 estate. The fact that a crematorium of such scale will be as close to our houses has erupted negatively within our neighbours. This is due to several reasons
1) Extreme proximity to the urban areas
2) Very congested road for such development
3) Environmental impact
4) Health impact
5) Cost impact
6) Existing housing value impact

In fact is hard to see where the benefits of such enterprise could bring to our community.

This kind of estate should be claimed within very isolated areas or at least with less obvious proximity to very dense populated areas.

The QEP association and other neighbours are going to dispute this specific plan projected up to the last consequences.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5912  Respondent: 15276385 / Anna Szyniszewska  Agent:

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

Residents in northern Guildford (Stoughton/QEP/Keens Park) are outraged by the proposal to erect a burial area with a crematorium in the Salt Box Lane in a shocking proximity to our community. The studies of negative impact of crematoriums in local health is well documented in scientific literature. The area is full of young families and therefore we would like to raise a strong objection to the proposed plan.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6952  Respondent: 15278849 / Giordano Mion  Agent:

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

There is widespread anger within our community due to the intention to erect a burial ground (crematorium) in shocking proximity to our Stoughton/QEP area (area A23 on map appendix H) due to the following concerns 1) Health and environmental issues 2) Construction issues 3) Traffic congestion.

The studies of the negative impact of crematoriums in local health is well documented.

The area is permanently affected by traffic jams that will be worsened.

Both conditions will lead to a negative drop in our life quality.

Our community hosts several families with young children (some of them suffering from asthma) that would be exposed to mercury pollution.

Paragraphs 1-6:

1) Extreme proximity to the urban areas
2) Very congested road for such development
3) Environmental impact
4) Health impact
5) Cost impact
6) Existing housing value impact

In fact is hard to see where the benefits of such enterprise could bring to our community.

This kind of estate should be claimed within very isolated areas or at least with less obvious proximity to very dense populated areas.

The QEP association and other neighbours are going to dispute this specific plan projected up to the last consequences.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1704  Respondent: 15345665 / Paul Rijbroek  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A23

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

I object to the moving of the Urban Boundary to encompass the site for the new Burial Ground north of Salt Box road. As far as I understand, it is not necessary to change the Status of the Land from Green Belt to Urban for a Cemetery. It is lawful to place a Cemetery on Green Belt, therefore there is no need to go to the cost of altering the land’s status. If Green Belt status is moved to Urban status, then a change of plan for this ground is easily implemented, even though it is adjacent to a Triple SI site.

If I have misunderstood, please confirm back to me.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6545  Respondent: 15345665 / Paul Rijbroek  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A23

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

I wish to object, on behalf of the Whitmoor Common Association, to the moving of the Urban Boundary to encompass the site for the new Burial Ground north of Salt Box road. As far as I understand, it is not necessary to change the Status of the Land from Green Belt to Urban for a Cemetery. It is lawful to place a Cemetery on Green Belt, therefore there is no need to go to the cost of altering the land’s status. If Green Belt status is moved to Urban status, then a change of plan for this ground is easily implemented, even though it is adjacent to a Triple SI site.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3110  Respondent: 15437889 / Janet Smith  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A23

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

Land north of Saltbox Road – allocated as a burial ground. I support this development, subject to suitable arrangements for parking and suitability of the site on environmental grounds.

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

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/5873  Respondent: 15576545 / Sylvie Fréret  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A23

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

I have recently discovered that the Area A23 on Salt Box Rd is 'now proposed to be used for a crematorium'.
I am strongly opposed to this proposition as the site is too close to residential area with young families and the exposure of air mercury and toxins pollution would be unavoidable and put at risk the local residents particularly the health of youngster living in North of Stoughton.
Having myself 2 child under 6, I am shocked this idea had been proposed, and families around will strongly react if it would be planned.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1290  Respondent: 16209409 / Natural England (Amy Steel)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A23

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

Policy A23: Land North of Salt Box Road, Guildford
This site is within 400m of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and whilst allocated for a new burial ground, potential impacts on the SPA must still be considered especially given that a new car park and site access is proposed. We would expect measures to be put in place to ensure that the car park is not available to the general public.
The site and the car park must not link to the Public Rights of Way which lead towards the SPA.
This site allocation is in very close proximity to the Whitmoor Common SSSI. Any direct or indirect impacts on this site should also be avoided or mitigated.

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

Attached documents:
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A24 - Slyfield Area Regeneration Project, Guildford
### Comment ID: PSLPS16/8112  **Respondent:** 8556385 / Guildford Residents Association, EGRA (Amanda Mullarkey)  **Agent:**  
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A24  
**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A24: Slyfield Area Regeneration Project  
Welcome. Important to avoid overdevelopment and limit the height of development  
See Appendix 4  
**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**  
**Attached documents:**

### Comment ID: pslp172/4275  **Respondent:** 8556385 / Guildford Residents Association, EGRA (Amanda Mullarkey)  **Agent:**  
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A24  
**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Welcome. Important to avoid over development and limit the height of development  
Policy on green approaches needs strengthening  
**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**  
**Attached documents:**

### Comment ID: pslp172/3923  **Respondent:** 8561377 / The Guildford Society (Julian Lyon)  **Agent:**  
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A24  
**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Slyfield Area Regeneration Project, Guildford – Whilst the Guildford Society was involved in early iterations of the proposed development of this site, there has been relatively little dialogue with the Council for many months and years. The allocation for 1500 homes (half as many again as previously proposed) is hard to comprehend without an indicative master plan of the project. We broadly agree with the amendments to the requirements and recognise the opportunities as realistic. If the density of residential is lower than 75 dpH for the area of the site allocated for housing, we would consider this as a suitable reallocation site for business uses from Walnut Tree Close and Woodbridge Meadows, where a density of 150 to 250 dpH can probably be accommodated.  
**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**  
**Attached documents:**
A poorly thought-out project in its current form. The site has no indicated main access point to provide for the proposed 2000 vehicles coming on or off the site daily.

This entrance should be displayed in this Plan. The Project is moving forward without the community involvement of a Local Plan Process. Moving on a whim the sewage treatment works, which is the most important piece of infrastructure in the whole community, to build houses fails basic logic and soundness tests.

It is noted that a highly sensitive Green Belt is adjacent to this site, bounding Clay Lane. In the infrastructure aspirations the non-essential Link Road is proposed to cross this area. This Link Road aspiration, being non-essential, should be removed in total from the Plan, as it is against the flood plain requirement that only ESSENTIAL INFRASTRUCTURE should be built on any Zone 3B Active flood plain. The fact that this road was never essential means that it should be removed from the Plan.

A key consideration is missing, namely ‘Contaminated Land’. No borehole information has been released for this site, all such information being labelled ‘confidential.’ As the land owner, it is assumed that GBC has these records, but GBC has chosen not to make them public during this Plan process. It is known from local evidence (malformed premature lambs) that the land is contaminated.

This project is therefore unsound in its current format.

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

Attached documents:

As acknowledged this site allocation presents major Priority habitat restoration/creation opportunities. Also adjacent to Riverside Park LNR/SNCI & Ancient woodland where due sensitivity is required.

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

Attached documents:

As acknowledged this site allocation presents major Priority habitat restoration/creation opportunities. Also adjacent to Riverside Park LNR/SNCI & Ancient woodland where due sensitivity is required.

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

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

We note too the inclusion of allotments in the SARP plans; but whilst there is a note in table 23 of on-site provision of allotments for sites of 250+ homes, there is no mention of allotments in other sites of 250+ homes in Guildford Town Centre or Guildford Urban Area. We believe that it is essential that they be included within the Blackwells Farm, and Gosden Hill developments; and whilst that intent would indicate two other sites in Guildford Town Centre should have allotments too, we recognise that may not be achievable in practise. There is a shortage of allotment provision in Guildford Town Centre, and thus additional provision should be made in the Urban Area to compensate for this. Whilst Stoke Park would be an excellent location for additional plots logistically (as you suggest), being close to where our demand is highest, we recognise that in practical terms it may not possible.

With regards to the SARP development, the timescale seems to have slipped. We are experiencing a degree of planning blight already, in that it is the only site we have with a few vacant plots, and no waiting list; people are not keen to take on a plot with limited future. We would welcome the plans to become better defined, and progress plans to relocate some tenants to alternative sites closer to their homes.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/576  Respondent: 8608865 / WBDRA. (David Bird)  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A24
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

WBDRA does SUPPORT this policy BUT SUBJECT TO full infrastructure improvements prior to any development.

Any development MUST take into account the findings of the Strategic Highway Assessment Report carried out by Surrey County Council on behalf of Guildford Borough Council relating to increased traffic both on Moorfield Road and the A320.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4529  Respondent: 8627393 / Worplesdon Parish Council (Gaynor White)  Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A24  SARP – Slyfield Area Regeneration Plan – Mixed use development  Support subject to full infrastructure improvements being provided prior to development to mitigate the impact on users. The Strategic Highway Assessment Report carried out by Surrey County Council, on behalf of GBC concludes that the Woking Road (A320) and Moorfield Road would experience increased traffic congestion and have levels of service indicators which would be at least unstable or where traffic demand exceeds capacity.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4199</th>
<th>Respondent: 8627393 / Worplesdon Parish Council (Gaynor White)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Support subject to full infrastructure improvements being provided prior to development to mitigate the impact on users. The Strategic Highway Assessment Report carried out by Surrey County Council, on behalf of GBC concludes that the Woking Road (A320) and Moorfield Road would experience increased traffic congestion and have levels of service indicators which would be at least unstable or where traffic demand exceeds capacity.

Support the additional opportunities proposed.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/992</th>
<th>Respondent: 8848033 / Paul Gerrard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

I object. Limited non-residential redevelopment on this site may be OK, but major development is not appropriate, due to the effect on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. It is within 5km, and therefore subject to EU/UK legislation (NPPF 119). The impact of development cannot be mitigated with SANGs because there is no evidence base to support SANGs as required by NRM6 viii, NPPF 158 and 166.

The flood risks seem understated. The site itself may be medium to low risk, but what happens to other areas if this area is concreted over? Presumably the overall capacity of the flood plain will be diminished. The existing flood plain did not cope with the floods of Christmas 2013, with Clay Lane being flooded (and closed) several times, and the fringes of Jacobs Well affected.

Additionally transport infrastructure feeding this area will need to be improved radically to prevent more clogging of the A320 and the atrociously designed A3 spurs (which is a motorway in all but name).

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3024</th>
<th>Respondent: 8854785 / Desmond McCann</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the hiding of development by “deferment” (A24, A25, A26, A43) This version of the Plan has concealed some development planned to take place by “deferring” it beyond the period covered by the Local Plan. This is designed to have 2 effects:

I) to hide the number of housed actually being built (A24, A25, A26 - total of 1100 deferred, but still being built!), and
ii) give an excuse for building houses on another site (A43 - 400/650 houses proposed) when they are not needed.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1117  Respondent: 8855201 / Catherine Harding  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A24
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Greenbelt - A development of this type will irrevocably change the character and rural aspect of Jacobs Well and the surrounding area. It is an unacceptable use of a greenbelt site. The site fulfills the remit of greenbelt in that it prevents urban sprawl and the coalescence of Guildford with Slyfield and Jacobs Well. It also safeguards the countryside and protects the unique historic setting of Guildford.

The proposed new road will cause too much damage to the area.

A Protected Species Survey and ecological survey must be carried out and if the ecological survey has found any protected species the development should not take place. The suggested barn owl fences and animal tunnels do not work therefore they should not be thought of as mitigation measures. The Barn Owl Trust has found that around 30% of all owls fledged are killed on major roads.

Having these species here should trigger wildlife enhancement not disregard.

Archaeology - It is too close to important listed buildings and the archaeological sit of the ancient Watts Farm House. In addition to this site and the other listed buildings along Jacobs Well Road.

Important Archaeological Site - This is the site of the New Flowing River.

This was cut by Sir Richard Weston of Sutton Park in 1618 and 1619. It is of National historic importance being the first attempt at controlling the flood waters of the Wey at this point and is the first step towards the construction of the Wey Navigation. It is the first example of this type in Surrey, possibly in the UK.

It ran from Stoke Mill through the area that is now the Slyfield Industrial Estate, through the fields of Burpham Court Farm to Sutton Place to irrigate the fields of Sutton Park by re channeling the winter flood waters of this area. It flowed under several bridges and had a cart way for maintenance. It can be traced trough documents at the Surrey History Centre and The National Archive. (TNA E178/5669).

Much of the little that is left of this unique fragment of our industrial heritage can be seen in the fields here and should be researched, preserved and protected. It should not become the site of a road.
Flooding and sustainability - The area floods regularly. The flooding is a result of water spreading over the fields towards the village and across Clay Lane from the river, ditches and surface water. Clay Lane has been closed due to flooding. Photographs are easy to find which illustrate this. The water table is high and drainage is poor. Any further development of Slyfield will exacerbate the problem and make flooding more widespread. The issue of flooding is acknowledged by the Surrey Flood Forum and Guildford Surface Water Management Plan.

The Plan states that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development; the development of an area which floods is not sustainable.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6119  Respondent: 8894657 / Jacob's Well Residents' Association (Janet Smith)  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A24
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the number of houses being proposed (current suggestion appears to be 1750).

The A320, which is planned as the access road, already exceeds capacity and no development should take place until proper access is sorted out. A high percentage of these homes should be affordable and prioritised for people for families awaiting housing in the Guildford area

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5688  Respondent: 8960097 / Ian Nicholls  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A24
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A24. The additional housing in the Burpham area is totally untenable. The infrastructure is already at bursting point after the Council's capitulation allowing the Aldi supermarket. To further add to this situation would be madness.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5810  Respondent: 9026145 / Helen McIntyre  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A24
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Slyfield Area Regeneration Project

Having recently experienced the foul odours emitted by some of the industrial plant at Slyfield Green (presumably the abattoir and waste disposal plant) I am concerned that GBC are considering building 1000 new homes as part of the Slyfield Area Regeneration Project. If GBC has legislative powers to ensure that industry does not cause air pollution, then I suggest that they use these powers to eradicate the unacceptable odours in the Slyfield area. I question whether it is ethical to build 1000 homes in a neighbourhood which, under current conditions, would be blighted by foul odours whenever the wind was in their direction. I also question to what extent it is healthy for babies and children to be raised in such an environment. Masking the foul stench with some synthetic, less disgusting odour is, in my opinion, not an acceptable alternative.

I note that in the Local Plan, under the Slyfield Area Regeneration Project, key considerations are stated as being: allotments, flood risk and design. However, reference to the effect of unacceptable air pollution on the quality of people's lives has been completely overlooked.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/414  Respondent: 10585825 / Mark Tordoff  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A24
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We urgently need better access between the Slyfield / Jacobs Well / Burpham area of Guildford and the A3.

Currently we have good access onto the A3 northbound, and off the A3 southbound. But we have no access whatsoever onto the A3 southbound, or off the A3 northbound. This already creates significant extra traffic going through and round Guildford, and the proposed new development at Slyfield is going to make this problem significantly worse.

I personally live in Jacobs Well Road, and I work in Farnham. So every morning I have to drive all round Guildford (Clay Lane, Salt Box Road, Worplesdon Road) in order to get onto the A3 southbound at the Wooden Bridge Roundabout. Then in the evening I have to do the exact same thing in reverse order, getting off the A3 northbound at the Wooden Bridge roundabout, then driving along Worplesdon Road, Salt Box Road, and Clay Lane. Surely it would make much more sense to avoid all this extra traffic through Guildford by providing improved access onto and off the A3 at the Burpham interchange.

We also need much better access onto Clay Lane at the northern end of Jacobs Well Road. Turning right out of Jacobs Well Road into Clay Lane is EXTREMELY dangerous, and there are regular accidents at this junction. I think there really should be either a roundabout or traffic lights installed at this junction, before somebody gets killed in a fatal car crash.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/391  Respondent: 10798049 / Steve & Maureen Knight  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A24
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Support in principle – housing must include a high percentage of affordable and social housing. Access to new houses an issue if not through Slyfield – other routes out needed in Bellfields. I fully agree with GBC decision not to include the field owned by Cassidy Slyfield in SARP.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5680   Respondent: 10856353 / David Howells   Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• A 24 Double impact with Slyfield Regeneration Project. The impact of any development at Gosden Hill must also be viewed in conjunction with the proposals at Slyfield. More than 20% of new housing in the Draft Local Plan is proposed within a 2 mile radius of Burpham which is hugely disproportionate to this region compared to the borough as a whole.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7775   Respondent: 11832961 / The National Trust - London and SE (Rachel Botcherby)   Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This policy currently makes no reference to the fact that it is sited within the visual setting of the Navigations and the River Wey Conservation Area. The Trust has provided detailed comments separately on the proposed Clay Lane Link Road proposals that are already being progressed, including the current planning application.

However, we are disappointed that no consideration has been drawn out in the policy to the need for new development to have regard to the impact on the wider setting of the Navigations from, inter alia, intrusive lighting, increased pollution, noise from vehicular traffic and intensity of use, visual intrusion (from the scale, height, and massing of new development), light pollution, increased risk of flooding and impact on the water table.

Given the facilities intended to be delivered on this site allocation, we would suggest that the policy seeks a comprehensive phased approach to redevelopment in line with an approved Masterplan that delivers the priorities listed in the policy, including the additional considerations listed above in respect of the River Wey, alongside more detailed urban design principles as appropriate to the different elements of the site allocation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1260   Respondent: 15280737 / Miller Developments (David Milloy)   Agent:
Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A24

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )

Whilst the original intention was to access this site via a new road from Clay Lane to the east; this option is no longer being pursued. The intention is now to access the site from the A320 Woking Road. This road is a principal route into Guildford which also serves the Slyfield industrial area and Jacobs Well. The Woking Road experiences significant congestion and not just at peak periods on the network.

The necessary highways infrastructure required to serve this site necessitates the developer providing the on-site section of the Sustainable Movement Corridor (SMC) and a proportionate contribution to the northern section of the SMC along the Woking Road. The details of the SMC are still to be confirmed and costed and could be frustrated by certain pinch points along the Woking Road, notably where the road crosses the Canal, the Bellfields roundabout and the roundabout serving the A3 north bound on-slip. To provide bus priority through these pinch points and through the A320/A25 junction will require significant widening and bridging.

The development is also required to provide a new sewage treatment works, flood mitigation and betterment and the relocation of the waste management depot.

The funding of the infrastructure improvements and the timing of delivery is still to be confirmed, as is the cost of re-provision of existing on site facilities. As a result of these uncertainties Miller is concerned about the viability of this development and its ability to deliver any significant level of affordable housing.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Policy A24 Slyfield – Objection

The development of 1000+ houses on this site with the access via Clay Lane will put a great deal more traffic onto the A3 and this will generate more traffic on the A247 from those wishing to go due south. In addition, the industrial site at Burnt Common (with a reference to a waste site) will be linked with the Slyfield Industrial Estate causing more movement of commercial vehicle on the A247.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

A24 - SLYFIELD REGENERATION SITE
• This is a brownfield site and as such clearly from that point of view is a preferable site.
• The previous use of the site (sewage and landfill) suggest material environmental issues which at the very least is likely to mean that there will be no development of this site in the next few years.

I hope that the Local Plan can proceed as soon as possible and that much needed affordable housing, specialist housing for the elderly and schools for our children can be developed. Having read the Surrey Advertiser article and hearing the commitments from the Earl of Onslow I feel Clandon Park Gold Club site would offer so much and the loss of a local golf course whilst disappointing is probably also inevitable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3111  Respondent: 15437889 / Janet Smith  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A24
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Slyfield Area Regeneration Plan  I object to the number of houses being proposed (current suggestion appears to be 1750).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3112  Respondent: 15437889 / Janet Smith  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A24
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Slyfield Area Regeneration Plan  I object to the number of houses being proposed (current suggestion appears to be 1750).

The A320, which is planned as the access road, already exceeds capacity and no development should take place until proper access is sorted out. A high percentage of these homes should be affordable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7887  Respondent: 15460737 / Donna Collinson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A24
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Welcome. Important to avoid overdevelopment and limit the height of development.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Policy A24

**Slyfield Area Regeneration Project Page 175 - 176**

There is no direct, or indirect reference to Clay Lane under this policy, even the southern element, which uses a substantial part of this site. Even though SARP may not be reliant upon the full link road going through, the northern part of the allocated site does include the southern network of roads/ roundabouts forming the Phase 1 of the Clay Lane scheme.

Under "Requirements, it may be appropriate to refer to the need to provide permeability for pedestrians and cyclists into and from the development, especially from the existing urban fabric of Guildford, in accordance with the Sustainable Movement Corridor scheme objectives. This could be referenced in the context of a justification for the developer contribution referred to under the third bullet point.

Surrey County Council’s education assessment finds that development of this site will require a new primary school. It is assumed that this is not referenced in Policy A24 because it is considered that Weyfield Primary School would be expanded to meet the need generated by the new development, given the proximity of the existing school to the site. This would be the preferred option, rather than building a new school which would compete with Weyfield. The school would need to expand by 1-2 forms of entry and a decision to take this option forward is dependent on the outcome of detailed feasibility studies that are being undertaken. If these find that it is not feasible to expand the school, additional land might be required to be allocated within the SARP area, in addition to a developer contribution. This reflects discussions between officers of our councils.

In the table headed Description under key considerations, the fact that some 11 ha of the site is allocated for waste management purposes in the Development Plan for the area (under Policy WD2 of the SWP) should be specifically acknowledged.

Under allocation we would like to see clarification by stating:

New or enhanced waste management facilities including the following facilities:

- Waste transfer station
- Community recycling centre
- Sewage treatment works

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Policy A24: Slyfield Area Regeneration Project, Guildford

The SARP site includes Thames Water’s Guildford (Slyfield) Sewage Treatment Works (STW) site and the draft Local Plan proposes the relocation of the STW as part of the SARP.

To ensure sufficient wastewater treatment for the Guildford drainage area, and suitable drainage network provision for the SARP area, the development of the SARP will require the relocation of the Sewage Treatment Works.

This would be in the form of a new sewage treatment works and necessary supporting local drainage network infrastructure.

Thames Water is working with the Council regarding the redevelopment of the SARP site and the feasibility of relocating the STW to the land identified in the draft Local Plan.

Thames Water confirms its support in principle for the relocation of the STW. Detailed technical and feasibility assessments are being produced with the Council to support the next stages of design for the STW relocation.

Omission Sites

Thames Water consider that the following sites may become available and would be suitable for development:

1. **Land to the north of Ash Vale Sewage Treatment Works (STW) (approximately 3 hectares)**

   The land to the north of the main operational area of Ash Vale STW, as identified on the enclosed plan, is currently disused. The site is sustainably located next to main urban areas, a main road junction with bus services and the North Camp Rail Station.

   The site is well contained to the north by the Blackwater River, to the west by the railway line, to the east by housing and to the south by the main operational STW. There is existing residential development south of Meadow Close and along Stratford Road to the east.

   The land is outside the Green Belt. Residential or employment development of the site could enable significant environmental improvements and part of the site to be opened up for public access along the river.

   1. **Land at Netley Mill PS, West of Gomshall (approximately 5 hectares)**
Gomshall is an identified settlement in the Green Belt. The Thames Water land of which parts would be available for development adjoins the settlement to the west as identified on the enclosed plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7800  **Respondent:** 15674273 / Savills for Thames Water (Katherine Jones)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A24

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Thames Water would welcome the opportunity to work closely with the Local Planning Authority and the developer to better understand and effectively plan for the water treatment infrastructure needs required to serve this development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: Water Treatment Works upgrades can take 18 months to 3 years to design and build.

The SARP site includes Thames Water’s Guildford (Slyfield) Sewage Treatment Works (STW) site.

The draft Local Plan proposes the relocation of the STW.

To ensure sufficient wastewater treatment for the Guildford drainage area, and suitable drainage network provision for the SARP area, the development will require the relocation of the Sewage Treatment Works and necessary supporting local drainage network infrastructure.

Thames Water is working with the Council regarding the redevelopment of the SARP site and the feasibility of relocating the STW to the land identified in the draft Local Plan.

Thames Water supports the principle of the relocation of the STW. Detailed technical and feasibility assessments are being produced with the Council to support the next stages of design for the STW relocation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7754  **Respondent:** 15746081 / Highways England (Patrick Blake)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A24

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

[Highways England made a formal representation on 18 July 2016. See the first attachment for this representation including comments on this element of the consultation documents and/or associated evidence base.

Highways England made further comments on 5 October 2016 following a clarification meeting with Guildford Borough Council. See the second attachment for this letter.]

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  
- Highways England letter 18 July 2016 - Representation to consultation.pdf (7.7 MB)
- Highways England letter 5 October 2016 - Further comments following clarification meeting with GBC.pdf (1.2 MB)
Policy A24: Slyfield Area Regeneration Project, Guildford
This site is adjacent to ancient woodland. Any direct or indirect impacts on this site should be avoided or mitigated.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Amendments have been made to the policy’s allocation, requirements, and opportunities. However, there has been a failure to mention a bespoke SANG which is a key requirement for the scheme to deliver.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to the hiding of development by “deferment” (A24, A25, A26, A43)

This version of the Plan has concealed some development planned to take place by “deferring” it beyond the period covered by the Local Plan. This is designed to have 2 effects:
i) to hide the number of houses actually being built (A24, A25, A26 – total of 1100 deferred, but still being built!), and
ii) give an excuse for building houses on another site (A43 – 400/650 houses proposed) when they are not needed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
4.34 GVG consider this to be a highly constrained site which includes flood risk, ecological and landscape constraints. It is noted that 11ha of the 40ha site is allocated for wastemanagement purposes under the development plan for the area. Once the other uses, such as industrial, open space, and areas for flood risk are accounted for, this would leave a constrained area to bring forward the proposed 1,500 units which would inevitably have to be delivered at a high density.

4.35 In addition to the proposed extension of Slyfield to the south (which is destined to be developed for residential uses at a considerable density) GVG recommends exploring an extension to the north for additional employment uses and a north Guildford Park & Ride at one end of the proposed Sustainable Movement Corridor. This can be achieved by removing an area of Green Belt that is former landfill with a narrower permanent green screen between the employment zone and neighbouring inset village of Jacobs Well. We also note the Plan is silent as to whether Slyfield might be the centre for CCHP facilities.

4.36 Given the high amount of industrial and commercial space to the north of the site, GVG consider that this would be a more suitable site for the relocation of industrial and commercial uses from the Walnut Tree Close and Woodbridge Meadows sites. Woodbridge Meadows is best suited to high density, high rise residential development and leisure space.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4798  **Respondent:** 17484449 / Thames Water Utilities Ltd (Sir or Madam)  **Agent:** Savills (Richard Hill)

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A24

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**Policy A24: Slyfield Area Regeneration Project, Guildford**

The SARP site includes Thames Water’s Guildford (Slyfield) Sewage Treatment Works (STW) site and the draft Local Plan proposes the relocation of the STW as part of the SARP.

To ensure sufficient wastewater treatment for the Guildford drainage area, and suitable drainage network provision for the SARP area, the development of the SARP will require the relocation of the Sewage Treatment Works.

This would be in the form of a new sewage treatment works and necessary supporting local drainage network infrastructure.

Thames Water is working with the Council regarding the redevelopment of the SARP site and the feasibility of relocating the STW to the land identified in the draft Local Plan.

Thames Water confirms its support in principle for the relocation of the STW. Detailed technical and feasibility assessments are being produced with the Council to support the next stages of design for the STW relocation.

----------------------

2374  A24 - Slyfield Area Regeneration Project (SARP)

| The water treatment capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Significant infrastructure upgrades are likely to be required to ensure sufficient treatment capacity is available to serve this development. Thames Water would welcome the opportunity to work closely with the Local Planning Authority and the developer to better understand | Infrastructure at the wastewater treatment works in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Significant infrastructure upgrades are likely to be required to ensure sufficient treatment capacity is available to serve this development. Thames Water would welcome the opportunity to work closely with the Local Planning Authority and the developer to better understand |
serve this development. Thames Water would welcome the opportunity to work closely with the Local Planning Authority and the developer to better understand and effectively plan for the water treatment infrastructure needs required to serve this development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: Water Treatment Works upgrades can take 18 months to 3 years to design and build. Implementing new technologies and the construction of a major treatment works extension or new treatment works could take up to ten years. The wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Strategic drainage infrastructure is likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a wastewater network capacity constraint the developer should liaise with Thames Water and provide a detailed drainage strategy with the planning application, informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1194  Respondent: 17991873 / Guildford Borough Council (Economic Deve (Sir or Madam) Agent: MADDOX (Matt Hill)

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A24

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Proposed Policy A24: Land Allocation - Slyfield Area Regeneration Project, Guildford

We support the allocation of land of land within the Slyfield regeneration area for mixed use redevelopment, including the provision of 1,500 homes. The policy states that 1,000 homes will be delivered within the plan period with the additional 500 homes to follow thereafter.

We consider the site capable of delivering the full residential capacity identified for the site within the plan period. However, we do not object to the policy as currently worded as we note that the housing delivery will be re-assessed as part of any Local Plan review which, as set out within the Planning Practice Guidance, is recommended to take place five years after the adoption of the Local Plan.  

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A25 - Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow Lane, Guildford
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8113  Respondent: 8556385 / Guildford Residents Association, EGRA (Amanda Mullarkey)  
Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A25: Gosden Hill Farm

See comments on questions 1 to 3

Policy on green approaches needs strengthening

Land for A3 tunnel entrance and works areas needs safeguarding

See Appendix 4

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4276  Respondent: 8556385 / Guildford Residents Association, EGRA (Amanda Mullarkey)  
Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

See comments on questions 1 to 3

Policy on green approaches needs strengthening

Land for A3 tunnel entrance and works areas needs safeguarding

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3126  Respondent: 8560833 / Mrs Carolyn Mayne  
Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A25 Gosden Hill:

The documents imply that there is a reduction to 1,700 new homes (from the earlier figure of 2,000). But it now appears this is misleading and that the lower figure is still a minimum. In any event, this scale of new homes planned is, in my opinion, so large as to inevitably damage the whole infrastructure of the area.
Infrastructure: The proposed changes to the access to the A3, together with other recent and proposed road system changes will, in my opinion, have such a large negative impact on Burpham as to inevitably cause major traffic disruptions and should be entirely reconsidered.

The proposed development will generate a daily movement of thousands of vehicles the vast majority of which will pass through Burpham. This Plan represents yet another ill-conceived planning proposal, with insufficient thought given to the infrastructure needed.

The last few decades have seen two major housing estates, a considerable number of smaller garden grabbing developments, one super store and, recently, one very inappropriately sited supermarket. Both because of the volume and reduced speed of traffic, these changes regularly lead to severe air pollution which damages the quality of our lives in Burpham. The current Plan represents a major worsening in an already unacceptable traffic and pollution situation.

Traffic at the Burpham roundabout is regularly brought to a standstill with cars and delivery vehicles queuing to get into Aldi's inadequate car park. New Inn Lane and London Road are already subject to long traffic queues at all times of day. Extra traffic will inevitably cause even worse delays and pollution.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2310</th>
<th>Respondent: 8561057 / Chris Brown</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gosden Hill (policy A25)**

The scale of the development proposal and its potential impact on the A3 and other local roads is a major concern. The provision of a rail link may help to partially alleviate the problem, but the number of houses proposed is far higher than is suitable for the location and unless the development is invisible from the A3 then it will detrimentally affect the appearance of the borough as a predominantly rural area.

I object to the large proposed development at of 2,000 houses at Wisley Airfield, 2,000 houses at Gosden Hill and 1,850 houses at Blackwell Farm because it will destroy large areas of Green Belt and agricultural land and produce congestion on the A3 and surrounding roads including Send.

I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are targeted at the Green Belt strung along the A3 which will destroy the open amenity of the borough and produce gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A247 which are all already at 100% capacity.

I object to the complete failure of GBC to identify sufficient brownfield sites within the urban area which should be targeted first for development before the open countryside and the Green Belt and the failure to include the Town Centre Masterplan 2015 within the plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2482</th>
<th>Respondent: 8561057 / Chris Brown</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Gosden Hill (policy A25)

The scale of the development proposal and its potential impact on the A3 and other local roads is a major concern. The provision of a rail link may help to partially alleviate the problem, but the number of houses proposed is far higher than is suitable for the location and unless the development is invisible from the A3 then it will detrimentally affect the appearance of the borough as a predominantly rural area.

I object to the large proposed development at of 2,000 houses at Wisley Airfield, 2,000 houses at Gosden Hill and 1,850 houses at Blackwell Farm because it will destroy large areas of Green Belt and agricultural land and produce congestion on the A3 and surrounding roads including Send.

I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are targeted at the Green Belt strung along the A3 which will destroy the open amenity of the borough and produce gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A247 which are all already at 100% capacity.

I object to the complete failure of GBC to identify sufficient brownfield sites within the urban area which should be targeted first for development before the open countryside and the Green Belt and the failure to include the Town Centre Masterplan 2015 within the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7990  Respondent: 8561377 / The Guildford Society (Julian Lyon)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

125. We reserve our comments made in respect of the Reg18 Consultation, and have attached a side-by-side analysis of the respective 2014 proposed allocations, our comments at the time and the Reg19 Consultation Draft.

126. Specifically, however, we identify below our comments in respect of Gosden Hill which has a larger land allocation than previously promoted.

127. GOSDEN HILL FARM:

127.1. In the deposit draft Local Plan, the area shown allocated for development at Gosden Hill Farm is estimated to have the potential to accommodate some 2,000 homes.

127.2. Whilst, in principle, the Society would regret the loss of open land forming part of the Green Belt, the Society acknowledged that there was potential to develop of a substantial area of land at Gosden Hill Farm and, if development was to take place, the development should provide for a new railway station at Merrow (on the site of the Surrey County Council Depot).

127.3. However, the Society’s position on what was proposed in the draft local plan was clearly set out in our response where we said, inter alia, “The Society does not support any development including P&R north of the east-west tree line dividing the site. (GBCS Potential Development Area C2) Development north of the line would impact adversely on the openness of the views on the approach to the town”.

127.4. The Society’s full response to Reg18 Consultation is set out below:

“The Society does not support any development including P&R north of the east-west tree line dividing the site. (GBCS Potential Development Area C2). Development north of the line would impact adversely on the openness of the views on
the approach to the town. There are substantial pluvial flooding issues that already affect Burpham and the land at C2 often ponds at its lowest points in heavy rain. The development of any of this land needs to have improved overall access to and from the A3. There consequently needs to be a reservation of land and policy support in the Local Plan for a 4-way all-movement A3 junction. Without improved access the impact on traffic in Burpham and on London Road will be severe and no development should be permitted. Development of the southern half of the site should include a railway station and the land should be reserved for that purpose. The openness of the site in the Green Belt fronting the A3 will be seriously harmed by development which will adversely affect the soft green edge of Guildford on the north side. The Society strongly believes development of this portion of site 59 (in the GBCS Report) should be resisted. To the extent that the area designated C1 in the GBCS Report is not viable or would cause irreconcilable issues in Burpham – and having regard to the emerging Neighbourhood Plan for Burpham – the site should not be allocated and the Green belt boundary left as it is today. The formation of a four-way junction (subject to Highways Agency confirmation and all technical due diligence) should be created so as to give access to the Slyfield area and the A320 without adversely impacting the main population centre of Burpham, and so as to relieve traffic on both the A320 at Slyfield and on the London Road between Burpham and Guildford.”

127.5. The Society’s concern on this issue remains as stated. One of the purposes of the Green Belt is to preserve the distinctiveness of towns and settlements which lie within the designated Green Belt area. At present the approach to Guildford down the A3 from London is that one is not aware of the existence of the built up area of the town until one crosses Woking Road and begins to see the commercial development at Ladymead. If the north facing slope of Gosden Hill Farm is to be developed with housing a key setting of the town will be forever lost. This will have a major impact of the perceived attractiveness of the town.

127.6. Furthermore, the objections we raised at the time of the draft local plan have been given increased cause for concern when, as shown in our side-by-side comparison document annexed to this response, the site at Policy A25 includes an additional area of frontage onto the A3 when compared to the Reg18 Consultation site 59. The impact of that increase in area is that even more housing development will spread alongside the south side of the A3. The impact of further development will be reinforced even further in consequence of the proposal in the deposit draft Local Plan to allocate for housing the triangle of land formed by the ‘new’ A3, the old A3 and Clandon Road at Burnt Common (i.e. the area currently partly occupied by Eubanks Auction Rooms).

127.7. On the 19th January 2015 the Burpham Community Association held a Public Meeting. The guest speaker was Councillor John Furey, SCC Cabinet Member for Roads, Traffic and Flooding. His brief was to consider any planned or proposed road construction or improvements that would impact on Burpham, especially the A3 and the Slyfield/Clay Lane link road.

127.8. It is interesting to note that the plan of the Gosden Hill site as displayed at the Burpham Community Association meeting (see below) shows a greater area of the wooded area being part of the proposed site compared with the deposit draft local plan (see plan on page 5) which shows a greater extent of development alongside the A3.

127.9. In respect of Gosden Hill Farm, the notes of the Burpham Community Association meeting stated. “Mr Furey noted the proposal to build an urban extension comprising 2,000 dwellings, some employment land, a local retail centre, community hall, primary school and GP surgery. The developer, Martin Grant, intend it to be “transport sustainable” with a need for a park and ride, a new railway station at Merrow and a new southbound slip onto the A3 (as shown on the map above). These proposals are subject to the SCC Transport Assessment process and GBC is co-ordinating assessment work in connection with the three main strategic development sites (Gosden Hill, Blackwell Farm and Wisley) to assess whether the wider reaching impacts of the total developments combined with their proposed mitigation will be acceptable. There are no time scales for Gosden Hill – the draft local plan is on hold – so it is possible for a developer to submit an application prior to any formal local plan designation.”

127.10. The note of the Burpham Community Association meeting continues: - “If this development were to go ahead, the impact on Burpham would be horrendous. 2,000 dwellings are likely to lead to 4,000+ extra cars on the road plus any generated by commercial/business activities and people travelling to and from the proposed station at Merrow. The lack of north bound access to the A3 means that traffic will travel through Burpham to the Clay Lane slip road. Traffic wanting to access the south bound A3 at present has to use the old bypass (invariably congested) or go north to Burnt Common and pick up the south bound there (adds mileage). With a new south bound access at Gosden Hill, people are far
more likely to use that – passing through Burpham. If the proposed Wisley development goes ahead, even more traffic will be travelling through Burpham”.

127.11. The Society’s analysis and comment is set out below: 127.11.1. The BCA analysis of the traffic impact is generally correct.

127.11.2. Certainly if the (notional) junction arrangements with the A3 as shown on the plan displayed at the Burpham Community Association meeting are implemented, all traffic from the proposed new development seeking to access the A3 northbound will need to travel through Burpham to access the existing slip road from Clay Lane.

127.11.3. Additionally, all traffic coming off the A3 from the south and seeking to access the proposed new development will tend to leave the A3 at the Cathedral interchange and travel via Ladymead, Parkway and London Road thus putting further pressure on these sections of the already overloaded town road system, albeit traffic could exit at Ripley northbound and double back from the Clandon entry slip.

127.11.4. There needs to be a sensitive solution to the A3 junctions at Burpham and Burntcommon to ensure a workable solution.

127.11.5. If a new Park and Ride facility (planned to provide between 500 and 700 spaces) is incorporated into the proposed development, this facility will be used by drivers from the north of Guildford and, on their return journey, those drivers will also need to travel through Burpham to access the A3.

127.11.6. The proposed new railway station at Merrow will attract traffic. Whilst provision of a new station is supported, the cumulative impact of the traffic generated by the extensive area of new housing and from the proposed Park and Ride facility is of serious concern for the area of Burpham and Merrow.

127.11.7. In addition to the above, residents from the 2,000 dwellings will also seek to travel into the centre of Guildford and whilst many people will no doubt use a new Park and Ride facility (and perhaps also the railway station), inevitably there will be increased traffic on London Road.

127.11.8. In this respect it is interesting to note the Policy for the proposed designation (Policy A25) which states the intention, as part of this development, to provide “associated infrastructure on the A3100 corridor within Burpham” (i.e. along London Road).

127.11.9. Just how the resulting increased traffic levels will be accommodated on London Road – particularly bearing in mind our understanding that London Road is to become part of a ‘sustainable transport route’ favouring cycling and buses – is, as yet, unknown.

127.12. In addition to the impact of additional traffic the issue of visual impact remains as a key issue of concern. If the Borough Council succeeds in securing approval to the principle of development of this extensive area of land then, as an absolute minimum, the Society considers the development must provide a significant depth of tree planting alongside the A3 in order to help minimise the serious adverse impact of this development.

127.13. Figure 8 (above) highlights (yellow) the area of the Bushy Hill LSOA, which, from the CABE analysis we have demonstrated could accommodate almost 1,800 homes. This illustrates that the southern part of the Gosden Hill site (closer to the proposed railway station) could accommodate this number of homes without needing to develop the slopes down to the A3, save as required for properly-designed road infrastructure to and from the A3.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3924</th>
<th>Respondent: 8561377 / The Guildford Society (Julian Lyon)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow Lane, Guildford – Notwithstanding and without prejudice to our previous comments in respect of this site, we broadly accept the amendments made to Policy A25. We do think land should be considered for the relocation of employment uses from Walnut Tree Close and Woodbridge Meadows which can accommodate homes at a much higher density than an urban extension site. We are also sorry to see the release of Green Belt land, largely as an admission of failure, on the part of decades of successive Councils, to comprehensively evaluate and regenerate brownfield sites. Allocation of Gosden Hill must also bring with it a commitment on the part of the Council to seek out planned densification opportunities in existing urban areas so as to ensure the redrawing of the Green Belt boundary is and remains permanent. We are concerned (Other Issues (22)) to see a Strategic Employment site divorced from the station and transport infrastructure, and occupying a site that very nearly coalesces with the south-western reaches of Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2893  Respondent: 8562145 / Mr Christopher Last  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO THE PLANS OUTLINES IN POLICY A25 This massive development, coupled with POLICY A43, would transform the rural nature of the villages of Send and Ripley to a sprawling suburb of Guildford. Our Green Belt lost forever!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2808  Respondent: 8562273 / The Clandon Society (Christopher Dean)  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

We object to Policy A25 Gosden Hill Farm.

1. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating the parish of West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce, defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds we believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and the houses along The Street in West Clandon (owned by the same developer as Gosden Hill Farm) will come under enormous pressure.

1. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
1. The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

1. The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement (see also below).

1. We object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon—a road which is already under traffic stress (see also below) and which Surrey County Council say cannot be improved.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3421  Respondent: 8562273 / The Clandon Society (Christopher Dean)  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of the green belt.

2. If this development proceeds, it leaves a narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and West Clandon. The same developer who is promoting Gosden Hill has several times tried to develop this land for housing. The current policy on treating green belt land as a developable resource means that it is only a matter of time before the village is joined up with the urban area.

3. The development will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford.

4. Together with the developments at Garlick’s Arch and Burnt Common there will be an almost uninterrupted ribbon of development along the A3 extending 5 miles from the centre of Guildford.

5. The development of this site will cause massive congestion in surrounding roads. It will generate many thousands of vehicle movements onto the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel large amounts of traffic onto the narrow, winding road through West Clandon and Send.

6. The proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to a 4 way junction at Burnt Common has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon and Send—a road which is already under traffic stress.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1450  Respondent: 8568193 / Miss Edwina Attwood  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West
Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land: all requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

We strongly oppose the planned development of Gosden Hill Farm with the second largest number of homes (2,000), eight traveller pitches, a new railway station, a park and ride, shops, primary and secondary schools, all situated in the Green Belt that includes an area of ancient woodland. As currently proposed this will have a devastating impact on Burpham, Merrow and other communities within this locality. Burpham is a victim of being at a major portal into Guildford. Already the traffic situation here is notorious and does the town no service; indeed it is a positive distraction. Access to the proposed development at Gosden Hill is by a new A3 southbound off/on slip road with the present...
southbound slip road to Burpham and Merrow becoming two-way. Thus all traffic from Gosden Hill going north to the M25, London and Heathrow will be forced to drive through Burpham to the Clay Lane Slip. How mad is that?

The only sensible solution is a four way intersection around Potters Lane as proposed three decades ago, providing north and south bound access to the A3. Yet here is the rub. A tunnel underneath Guildford is once again being supported by GBC as a way to alleviate pressure on the road network. It would cut out more than 6 miles of the A3, from Ripley to Compton and is part of the Borough Transport Strategy 2016. If it is decided that a tunnel is the only answer to Guildford’s traffic problem, it is short sighted in the extreme to dump homes and all associated infrastructure on land that would be used for a tunnel entrance. There seems to be a lack of consistency and joined up thinking and therefore we can only conclude that as presently formulated the Gosden Hill proposals are deeply flawed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2572  Respondent: 8573505 / Anthony & Hazel Teal  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As a resident initially of Merrow from 1960 but having lived in Burpham for the last 34 years my principal concerns are with issues that impact on these areas. In particular we refer to Policy A25, Gosden Hill Farm. Here it is proposed there will be developed at least 1,700 homes within the plan period as well as a new local centre, primary and secondary schools, a park and ride facility with 500-700 car parking spaces and a railway station. To accommodate this new village, the infrastructure requirements propose a new improved junction on the A3 comprising a relocated southbound off-slip, a new A3 southbound on-slip connected via a new roundabout to the A3100 with an associated corridor within Burpham.

This is a totally inadequate response that completely ignores the impact it will have on the wider community. Burpham is already the recipient of a traffic overload resulting from a lack of joined up planning decisions over many years with scant regard for the essential long term infrastructure necessary to accommodate what has already been developed. The daily outcome is a steady slow-moving column of traffic that winds its way from the A3 around and into the centre of Burpham while in the opposite direction vehicles of all types endeavour to access the north bound A3 via Clay Lane. There has been a big increase in HGVs and large diesel cars journeying to access residential and commercial properties and most notably for the two superstores at the village centre. Indeed on 6/12/2016 the Planning Inspectorate gave Aldi approval to increase HGV deliveries from one to seven per day despite local concerns, a simple example of another apparently "small" incremental effect with no regard as to the long term consequences.

Now add to this the residential traffic from the proposed Gosden Hill Village which at an absolute minimum is (1,700 x1.8 cars per house) = 3,060 vehicles daily. Under the proposals of the improved junction, unless travelling south down the A3 from the proposed new roundabout, they must travel along the A3100 (London Road) and into Burpham in order to access Guildford/Woking/Dorking/northbound slip of the A3. It is not unrealistic to suppose that this extra traffic including commercial vehicles will be of the order of 4,500 vehicles per day, morning and evening. Also local traffic wanting to access the south bound A3 and avoid Guildford centre will be making a bee-line through Burpham and up the A3100, now two-way, to the new roundabout at the Gosden Hill site. On this basis alone the scheme proposed is deeply flawed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4292  Respondent: 8573793 / Harry Eve  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Site A25 Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow Lane, Guildford

I object to this site being included. It is Green Belt and there are no exceptional circumstances. These fields and woodland separate Burpham from West Clandon. Taken with other sites proposed it will form part of a ribbon development along the A3. The site would generate large volumes of additional vehicle traffic onto roads that are already congested.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3730  Respondent: 8574369 / Douglas French  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the proposals for Gosden Hill because they breach the Green Belt, put West Clandon in danger of being joined up to Guildford and will generate excessive extra traffic for Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8312  Respondent: 8575585 / Ian Macpherson  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A25 : Gosden Hill Farm

This is a most unfortunate proposal, presumably initiated by developers who, I have been told, has been 'banking' the land for some decades, and now taken up by GBC.

There are a number of specific issues which have been, I read, identified by the local Residents Association, such as traffic flow into town.

However the key issue for me is a Green Belt issue - the potential change in nature of the entry into Guildford along the A3. At the moment, it is openfields, with a long view up to the North Downs, as far as the Burpham Slip Road, where a tree line provides a hard edge to the town. The A3 itself then continues south in an artificial cutting, making a sharp contrast from open countryside to the urban character of landscaped town road. Although the details of the urbanisation of the Farm are not yet available, it is difficult to see how the long view can be retained, and Guildford not be seen as building significantly further towards London. This would seem to cut across the principles of the NPPF, in loss of valued viewsand in gradual coalescence [ribbon development, if you like] towards London - a marked loss of openness.

Refer - NPPF 80-3, 80-4, 88 and 109, and appeals such as - Spurstow, Tarporley, Cheshire East, Aylestone Hill, Hereford

The fact that the A3 is a notional highway, almost of the importance of a Motorway, carrying large numbers of people, from commuters to holidaymakers and country lovers, each day, compounds the significance of this proposal. While
landscape appraisal normally gives a low rating to views from cars, the number of cars is so significant here that this becomes a very high and major 'material' matter.

It would be difficult to find a place where more damage would be done to the Green Belt environment.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1858  Respondent: 8579233 / Mrs Purrett  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

5. POLICY A25 - Cosden Hill Farm
I object to this revised proposal as although the previous intention to construct 2000 homes on this site has been reduced to 1700 homes this does not reduce the appalling effect that the scheme would have on the surrounding local roads and the A3. I object that the number of house proposed is still far too high and unless the development is hidden from the A3 will once again affect the appearance of the borough as a predominantly rural area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/5427  Respondent: 8579233 / Mrs Purrett  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

5. POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm
I object to this revised proposal as although the previous intention to construct 2000 homes on this site has been reduced to 1700 homes this does not reduce the appalling effect that the scheme would have on the surrounding local roads and the A3. I object that the number of house proposed is still far too high and unless the development is hidden from the A3 will once again affect the appearance of the borough as a predominantly rural area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8325  Respondent: 8581089 / Jenny Wicks  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Site policies
A25
I object to this policy. No evidence is put forward to justify ‘exceptional circumstances’ for removing it from the Green Belt.

Gosden Hill currently defines the edge of the urban area and prevents the coalescence of Guildford with the village of West Clandon. It also checks the unrestricted sprawl of urban Guildford into what is quite clearly the rural area beyond and safeguards the countryside from encroachment.

Development here will represent undesirable ribbon development along the A3 and will add significantly to traffic flows on the A3 at this point.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7945  **Respondent:** 8581505 / Burpham Neighbourhood Forum (Jim Allen)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

This Policy is unsound as it proposes land usage policies of park and ride, railway station and housing.

It is the potential site for the suggested tunnel under Guildford. If the tunnel is accepted as the cure for the traffic problems through Guildford, then this site is in effect sanitised against housing until that decision is made.

Note: There are previous comments in full earlier in our representation [Section 7].

As it stands the timing and proposal for this site are unsound.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLP172/4089  **Respondent:** 8581505 / Burpham Neighbourhood Forum (Jim Allen)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( No ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( No )

**Sub section 2**

Gypsies are traditionally roamers. Will these sites be very short term lease or errantly taken by one family as a permanent home? If they are permanently taken what will happen to the travellers who want a temporary space? Additional wording as to longevity of tenure should be included in Policy A25.

**Infrastructure**

An all movement junction is essential as roads in Burpham are already over capacity. Anything less is an abdication of responsibility in respect of reducing pollution and easing traffic congestion within the Ward.
Subsection (1) should be wholly removed as this is unsustainable and fails to even ‘try’ to mitigate or solve the traffic problems already in existence and the problems this development at Gosden Hill will cause the community of Burpham. A single sided A3 access fails to provide a sustainable park and ride system, fails to provide access to the site from the south, fails to provide a departure route to the M25 and fails to acknowledge that a four-way was regarded as essential in 1984 whereas traffic in the past 20 years has increased by over 40%. Since the traffic estimate in 1979 [see estimate below in relation to the construction of the A3 in 1979], when the growth was predicted at 65% up until 1995, and since that time has increased a further 40% (May 20th 2016), it is irrational in the extreme to make a claim that a single sided access is now acceptable here at this site.

Subsection (3) sets out requirements for a park and ride facility. This requires an all ways junction to make the proposal sustainable, as any ‘park and ride user’ will want to return in the same direction as arrival, i.e. towards the M25. No provision has been made for the un-quantified number of cars [possibly now in excess of 1,000 vehicles as max number not specified nor land area required]. Furthermore the rational route for any park and ride bus would be out onto the A3 down to the A320 and the same route in reverse. Introducing buses into Burpham as part of this park and ride project, which do not pick up along the route, will simply increase pollution within the London Road corridor. There is no opportunity to widen the road to accommodate a ‘third and fourth lane’ to allow free movement of public transport.

Subsection (8) The use of the word ‘mitigation’ in (8) is weaker than the word ‘cure’ and implies a predilection to a reduction in viability and sustainability of the existing community of Burpham, forcing it to suffer from the vagaries of legal and political argument, rather than a practical and sound planning resolution to the problems created on the infrastructure by the selection of this site as an extension of Burpham.

Subsection (9) The use of the word ‘mitigation’ in (9) is weaker than the word ‘cure’ and implies a preference to a reduction in viability and sustainability of the existing community of Burpham, forcing it to suffer from the vagaries of legal and political argument rather than a practical resolution of the problems created within the infrastructure by the selection of this site as an extension of Burpham. The wording is seriously weak and provides no protection for the community of Burpham from cost saving exercises to allow this development to go ahead, in the full knowledge that the community of Burpham is left naked to this intrusion of vehicles, low water pressure and overflowing sewers. This policy fails to comply with section 152 of the NPPF, which states:

152. Local planning authorities should seek opportunities to achieve each of the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development, and net gains across all three. Significant adverse impacts on any of these dimensions should be avoided and, wherever possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued. Where adverse impacts are unavoidable, measures to mitigate the impact should be considered. Where adequate mitigation measures are not possible, compensatory measures may be appropriate.

The item(3) in the opportunities section of the policy is suggesting that land is required to be set aside to allow for such a route to occur, yet no land has been set aside for access at this point.

https://issuu.com/broadwaymalyan7/docs/gosden_hill_village_guildford - vi

This very late addition to this policy was not included in the Reg 18 documentation and fails to identify where this link road should be introduced. [Noting no traffic study has been completed on this proposal and unlike Blackwell Farm no new junction layout has been displayed]. No legal access currently exists between the site and Merrow Lane, save at the current farm entrance. This would mean that the local Green Space recently designated in the Burpham Neighbourhood Plan would be substantially affected by such a proposal, contrary to the wishes of the community of Burpham.

In general terms the policy as currently worded is deficient for the following reasons:
(1) the Gosden Hill site is separated from the community of Burpham by common land, Ancient woodland and Local Green Space, as designated in the Neighbourhood Plan, along its full length from London Road to New Inn Lane. At no point will this site merge with the community of Burpham, thus it will be a cul-de-sac village on the outskirts of Guildford, not really part of the urban area. Eg it will be similar to Jacobs Well – adjacent to but separate from the urban area. There are question marks over its sustainability if developed along the terms set out in this policy.
(2) We are concerned by the lack of reference to the need to provide adequate drainage at an early stage of planning, preferably by setting out minimum drainage requirements within the wording of the policy. This is strongly advised due to access to sewers being restricted by the current system, which is subject to hydraulic lock on the gravity section of the Burpham sewer precluding connection to the Burpham sewer system (which carries Merrow sewage as well. Thus the site assessment is substantially flawed see page 72 at web site https://issuu.com/broadwaymalyan7/docs/gosden_hill_village_guildford_v6

(3) 1/3 of the site is subject to the Burpham Neighbourhood Plan, which is not mentioned in the above policy and it should be in the Key Evidence.

(4) The site is currently designated Green Belt and has a strong defensible boundary with Burpham. Changing this boundary to an indefensible fence line endangers the very principle of the Green Belt.

NPPF Para 80. Green Belt serves five purposes:
- to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas
- to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another

- to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
- to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land

Moving the Green Belt line from the current solid line to its new proposed location fails to meet requirements of bullet point 3.

[Image]
Existing defensible boundary [above]

[Image]
Indefensible boundary

There has been no demonstration of exceptional circumstances as required by section 82 of the NPPF to move the Green Belt line at this location.

83. Local planning authorities with Green Belts in their area should establish Green Belt boundaries in their Local Plans which set the framework for Green Belt and settlement policy. Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. At that time, authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period. Does the map below suggest that the new line is safe?

The proposed boundary line fails to ensure ‘their intended permanence’. The current Green Belt line established during the original Green Belt exercise has worked well for over 60 years. Moving that line will destroy its principles. As displayed in page 100 of the developer’s promotion document where the new line is to be fundamentally destroyed by harvesting the trees on this site.

https://issuu.com/broadwaymalyan7/docs/gosden_hill_village_guildford_v6

[Image]

Potential air quality issues – this is incorrect as the word ‘potential’ suggests that mitigation and obfuscation might make the problem go away. The reality is that the site alongside the A3 (the old C2) is subject to air pollution and also fails to
record the noise constraints alongside the A3 noting this was ‘tested’ alongside existing homes. Introduction of new homes would mean the area would be extended north east.

This site is within a noise and air pollution action area designated by DEFRA.

The claim to be any ‘grade’ of farm land is spurious as there is no detailed land study of this farm available from MAFF using the 1988 criteria. – noting sections are Grade 2 farmland taken from the adjoining Dodswell farmland assessment. Yet the document Gosden Hill Village Vision and Development framework document claims it is Grade 2 farmland – the question arises “should we be using Grade 2 and 3a farm land (our food source land) for housing developments such as this?”.

Claiming it is sustainable to build on prime farm land is an anathema.

Changes not made, that should have been made by now - without instigation of the residents’ comments but ignored by the Guildford Borough Council.

(1) The refusal to make public the raw data and formulae used to calculate the SHMA addendum suggests that it is fundamentally flawed.

(2) No exceptional circumstances have been publicised to justify movement of the Green Belt boundary from the current urban development line in Burpham.

(3) Correction of statements in the transport documents, which fail to accept that a road is running at capacity, according to the documents “Road Capacities by John Van Rijn of Indevelopment” or of the Ministry of Transport document design manual for Roads and Bridges Volume 5 Section 1 part 3 Traffic Capacity Urban roads. If the road capacity is being exceeded or greater than 75% then there is a clear requirement to solve the current problem prior to agreeing to add more traffic to that road. For example Clay Lane is running one car every 3 seconds westward during the rush hour, exceeding capacity of 1020 vph with a 60/40 split on road type UAP2. The total both ways is exceeded by a single line of traffic in excess of 1020vph going west. Clearly any proposal to increase this traffic level is unacceptable and, as the current problems are ‘severe’, they can only deteriorate to ‘very severe’. This alone provides the exceptional circumstances for not building in the Green Belt.

(4) Withdrawal of this Burpham road scheme “south on / off mitigation” for traffic problems caused by Policy A25: as it was pre-designated inadequate in 1984 to solve the traffic problems of this site when it was half the proposed size of A25.

(5) Removal of claimed ‘junctions improvements’ through Burpham. They are a fundamentally flawed proposal, because journeys through this area will increase, from the current 13 right turns for 11 routes to this proposal, which increases to 20 right turns for an improvement to 13 routes. While an all-way junction with link to the A25 would reduce the number of right turns to 11 and provide 18 new routes through the area, this would decreasing traffic congestion throughout the north of the borough; through Ripley, Send, Burnt Common, West Clandon, Merrow and Burpham.

(6) The correction of the Green Belt study, to ensure a rational balance to the traffic-light study, is achieved.

(7) The ‘walk to’ distances of the old C1 C2 site, now Policy A25, should be re-assessed because of the assumptions, as all access is now displayed as entering and exiting the A3 side of the site and it has been extended north east towards Send and West Clandon. Thus any assumption of ‘walk to’ distances via Merrow Lane, are fundamentally flawed and scores achieved are incorrect.

(8) No account has been taken of the grade of farmland as identified in Policy A25 which, although untested by the Min Ag&Fish, is highly likely to come out Grade 2 as it was part designated with this status some years ago, when an adjacent
farm was designated with Grade 2 [Plot C3 and part of C2]. It is irrational to use up quality farmland when lower Grade 4 is available to the west of the Borough.

Notwithstanding our specific comments on wording and detail within this confined and incomplete REG 19 non-statutory consultation we find we need to make more general comments following research on the overall Guildford Borough Local Plan. The following section must be considered in the light of this compromised Reg 19 public consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  BNF comments Local Plan 19 07 17 23 25 table.pdf  (5.3 MB)

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2056  Respondent: 8581889 / Joan Barnett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The proposed area of Gosden Hill Farm is part of the Green Belt which acts as a buffer to prevent sprawling development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5995  Respondent: 8582017 / The Clandon Society (J Wright)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data
• Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
• Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
• Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
• Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

• 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays

  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

• 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
• 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
• 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.
Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6450  Respondent: 8582977 / Guildford Environment Forum (John Bannister)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.
The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/4189</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8585601 / Jennie Kyte</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POLICY A25: Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow Lane, Guildford**

The number of houses has been reduced from 2000 to 1,700 for this plan period, but the same amount of land has been allocated and further development is indicated. This is a very large development which will impact on local roads in Burpham where traffic is heavy during peak hours. The roads were not built to carry heavy volumes of traffic.

I object to this development for the reason above and for the reason set out in my submission to the 2016 Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7083</th>
<th>Respondent: 8586369 / Mr Luigi Fort</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.
If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4713</th>
<th>Respondent: 8586369 / Mr Luigi Fort</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below). The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
8. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan and specifically to the development at Gosden Hill Farm -

I do not agree that the council need to build 14,000 new homes I feel there is a lack of evidence for the alleged housing need numbers - independent reviewers do not agree with the Council's number of 693 per year and the plan does not include any constraint on this figure.

The proposed sites including Gosden Hill Farm are all in a straight line in one area of the borough, there is therefore a disproportionate level of development in this area.

The development of Gosden Hill would move Guildford 3 miles north up the A3 and include the loss of a large area of Green Belt, the loss of Green Belt is unacceptable.

The development at Gosden Hill Farm will bring a vast amount of traffic into an already congested area and there is no provision in the plan for specific infrastructure. Without the correct infrastructure the increased traffic will make it almost impossible to drive into Guildford Centre from the Burpham/Merrow area which will discourage people from visiting the town centre, working in Guildford and will also be a disincentive for businesses who will move to towns with a better and planned traffic infrastructure or to out of town sites.

The proposed sites are all along the A3 and a decision needs to be made on the future of this road prior to any developments - if a tunnel is the answer to the traffic congestion problems the site of this must be decided first, if not a tunnel, what other improvements are to be made and where, all of this must be decided prior to any development.

If a small town/village like Hindhead can get a tunnel on the A3 surely a large town like Guildford should be lobbying for a tunnel and perhaps the Council could put some energy into this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3196  Respondent: 8586785 / Elizabeth Critchfield  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A25 Gosden Hill

My reasons for objecting to the changes in this policy are as follows:

1. The housing number would appear to have been reduced to 1,700 until you look closely and realise that that figure is a minimum build, leaving 300 homes to be delivered after the plan period.

2. The "improved" two way junction is nothing of the sort. The proposed development - houses, commercial and office premises, a Park and Ride, a station - will generate thousands of vehicles. Any vehicle leaving the development, unless accessing the southbound A3, will travel through Burpham; local traffic wanting to access the southbound A3 will travel through Burpham. The impact on the community will be horrendous. I live along the A3 slip road and am daily witness to the traffic congestion; a slow moving trail of cars, commercial vehicles and an increasing number of HGVs that sometimes judders to a halt. This can be caused by incidents on the southbound A3 that cause traffic to back up and endeavour to escape down the Burpham slip road. It can also result from the planning disasters that Burpham has had to endure over the last few decades with no thought given to infrastructure. We are talking of what is happening NOW - what on earth will it be like if this proposal goes ahead without proper infrastructure? The visible current overloading of our road system is one thing; the invisible result - air pollution - is another. Pollution makes people ill, sometimes kills them. National government is concerned, so should you be.

3. Access/egress to and from the development is from one roundabout; block that and no one can get in or out, including emergency vehicles. That is incredibly bad planning, unless of course you are emulating Blackadder with a cunning plan that could possibly involve another entrance in Merrow Lane.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6905  Respondent: 8589953 / Michael R. Murphy  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the proposals for Gosden Hill because they breach the Green Belt, put West Clandon in danger of being joined up to Guildford and will generate excessive extra traffic for Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2973  Respondent: 8590753 / Mr Michael Anning  Agent:
## Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

### Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/8281</th>
<th>Respondent: 8591041 / Surrey Wildlife Trust (Mike Waite)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within BOA TBL02 Clandon to Bookham Parkland; development should be scaled appropriate to environmental constraints and assist achievement of BOA objectives (inc. protection, restoration &amp; creation of Priority habitats, inc. Mixed deciduous woodland, Wood-pasture &amp; parkland, Meadows, Hedgerows, Ponds). There is Ancient woodland present on the site, while both Cotts/Merrow Lane Woods SNCIs are adjacent and their protection must be assured. The Trust reserves further representation on the scale of development currently allocated here if these tensions cannot be satisfactorily reconciled.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1233</th>
<th>Respondent: 8591041 / Surrey Wildlife Trust (Mike Waite)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey Wildlife Trust recognises the decelerated phasing of development here (from 2000 to 1700 dwellings over the life of the Local Plan). The Trust retains its reservation for further representation on the specific development management decisions at this site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6578</th>
<th>Respondent: 8591169 / Michael Bruton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. I object to the inclusion of Gosden Hill (A25) in the local plan. Gosden hill meets all the five requirements of the Green Belt.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/796</th>
<th>Respondent: 8597761 / Mrs Pippa Fleming</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the inclusion of the planned development of 2000 houses at Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow (Policy A25) in clear contravention of the Government's and Conservative councillors' election manifesto promises to protect the Green Belt. I object to the unsustainable nature of the site, the poor air quality and noise pollution levels that will result and the infrastructure deficit that will result.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7927</th>
<th>Respondent: 8607169 / CPRE Surrey Branch &amp; Guildford District (Tim Harrold)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CPRE OBJECTION TO POLICY A25 : Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow Lane, Guildford**

CPRE has many reasons for considering this proposal unsound which are listed below:

1. The land which is proposed for development is all open Green Belt countryside of an attractive character which it is now suggested should be surrendered to urban sprawl. The NPPF states “the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence”. Boundary changes to the Green Belt can only be made at the time of a Local Plan consultation in “exceptional circumstances”. The draft Local Plan does not provide sufficient detailed evidence of the strategic development proposed to meet this requirement. The Green Belt between Burpham and West Clandon forms part of the green approach to Guildford and provides a clearly defined boundary to the urban area. Much of the building proposed falls within the Parish of West Clandon but the principal impact of the traffic from the new site will be experienced in Burpham which already suffers badly from congestion and air pollution. It is felt that a better solution to these problems is required.

1. The proposal cannot be considered seriously until Highways England have decided how the A3 infrastructure can best be handled in this sector. No decision is likely to be made by them until at the earliest 2020. Their
policy requires that 4 way junctions have to be set at a specified distance apart which at the moment seems to rule out the use of land adjoining Potters Lane.

1. It is equally important that a decision is made about a possible tunnel for Guildford as it will be necessary to decide where provision for access should be made in the vicinity of Burpham. It is not known exactly what route the tunnel will follow but Compton has been mentioned as its possible other entrance. As far as we know, there are only estimates available as to its likely cost and the time that it would take to build. If a tunnel were to be used to link Burpham and Compton, substantial additional road infrastructure would be needed for the B3000 both at Puttenham and Compton.

1. Planning as to whether a railway station at Merrow will be built seems to be uncertain and depends on decisions involving Network Rail. We are informed there is no reference to a railway station at Merrow in the Wessex Plan for future railway development. The station can only therefore be considered in an aspirational category as so few details are available as to its design, exact location, operation, car and bus access and parking provision. Space currently occupied by the Surrey depot in Merrow will we understand be used on one side of the track but there is no information as to the rest of the station layout including a bridge over the lines. Road access for the station will probably require the replacement of the railway bridge over Merrow Lane near its junction with New Inn lane (B2234) where lights control the traffic.

1. Before 2000 houses could be built at the site proposed, water supply, the sewage network, and other infrastructure issues would need to be resolved. We are informed that the electricity pylons near the A3 would also need to be changed owing to a capacity requirement.

1. There has been a history of linear development along the A3 in Burpham, The latest example Wey Lea was promised a range of community facilities which we believe never materialised. Burpham residents do not want this experience to be repeated for the proposed new settlement and are doubtful from past experience that undertakings in this context will be honoured.

1. Plans for a Slyfield Link Road also now appear largely aspirational. There is little confidence either in Burpham at present about the value of plans for a "sustainable movement corridor". It appears that London Road will form part of the SMC with two way traffic in single lanes plus an additional lane in each direction for buses and cycles. It is felt that this will add to an already difficult traffic situation.

1. The Burpham Community Association issued the following statement at a well attended public meeting on 11th July 2016 regarding development of Gosden Hill Farm and its "huge impact" on Burpham:

"Two thousand homes, offices and industrial sites, a Park and Ride for up to 1,000 cars, two schools and the possibility of a new station at Merrow will put thousands more vehicles on to already very congested roads. Access to the proposed development is by a new A3 southbound off/on slip road and the present slip road to Burpham and Merrow will become two way. This means that all traffic from Gosden Hill wishing to use the northbound A3 will have to drive through Burpham to the Clay Lane slip".
The BCA goes on to say that “the only sensible solution is a four way intersection around Potters Lane as proposed in the 1980s, which would give north and south bound access to the A3. If it is decided that a tunnel is the only answer to Guildford’s traffic congestion, then it is short-sighted to dump homes and all the associated infrastructure on the most suitable land for a tunnel entrance.”

1. The other A3 entrance to the possible tunnel may need to be located at Compton which also suffers heavily from road traffic congestion and air pollution on the B3000. CPRE does not pretend to have the necessary engineering knowledge as to the practicability of such a solution nor of the possible cost and time needed for its implementation. We do, however, know something about the successful introduction of the Hindhead tunnel in Waverley, and we recall that it was clearly indicated when the decision was taken to go ahead there, that the former traffic congestion at Hindhead would reappear at Guildford a few miles down the A3 once the tunnel was built. This has duly occurred. It would seem logical that if an A3 tunnel is considered desirable at Hindhead to keep the traffic flowing and also protect the countryside, then surely it should at least be considered as a possible solution now at Guildford to reduce congestion and improve the urban environment and quality of life of those living in and visiting the county town.

1. The evidence on future traffic conditions which is produced in the Strategic Highway Assessment Report (SHAR) has been produced late and is unfinished. This vital input has not been available in time for it to inform the draft Local Plan or the subsequent consultation. CPRE considers that this whole proposal is not ready for enclosure in the draft Local Plan and is therefore unsound.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3882</th>
<th>Respondent: 8607169 / CPRE Surrey Branch &amp; Guildford District (Tim Harrold)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

CPRE welcomes the change made to reduce the housing figure to 1700, although this is still far too high, and is in fact a minimum figure and not the end of the story. The text makes clear that the intention is to build at least 300 additional houses, as and when possible, after the plan period.

It appears that little attention has been paid to the criticism expressed over a year ago by many Guildford residents and the Burpham community in particular. CPRE considers that its objections made at that time are still valid and feels obliged to express its additional concern about the subsequent proposals under discussion.

There is no adequate resolution of the complaints about road infrastructure and traffic congestion. Every car driver travelling through Burpham knows that this is frequently one of the worst bottlenecks on the approaches to Guildford with its multi roundabout layout. Local residents are even more conscious of the deteriorating traffic situation with the opening of Aldi, and this will not be improved in our opinion by what is now proposed for the Sustainable Movement Corridor. As the Burpham Community Association points out this proposal will not be successful as the roads are too narrow and have pinch points. The prospect of how the London Road will be transformed into having four lanes of traffic where only two exist at present is daunting. It is not enough to recognize that a key consideration may be air pollution from the new building development envisaged. CPRE would like to know how this can be avoided given the additional diesel road traffic consisting not only of slow moving cars but also more HGVs which will service new schools, businesses, shops and a Park & Ride.
CPRE notes that the A3 Tunnel is still an “aspirational” topic in the plan. If this is to be taken seriously, then Gosden Hill Farm cannot be considered for development along the lines proposed as those responsible for planning will have to know first what Highways England intend for the A3, and secondly, where any access points to a new tunnel would need to be located in this vicinity. Planning without this information first would be irresponsible.

All of the land proposed for development in the Policy A25 sector currently falls within the Metropolitan Green Belt at Gosden Hill Farm. CPRE is concerned that any building on the scale envisaged would lead to further congestion problems and additional severe road infrastructure issues.

CPRE is particularly concerned with the need to avoid further linear development along the A3 which amounts to urban sprawl and threatens the eventual merging of Burpham with West Clandon. The attractive open Green Belt countryside on this A3 approach to Guildford, with its clearly defined natural boundary, is a major asset which should be retained and not lost.

CPRE fully endorses the submissions made by the Burpham Community Association and the West Clandon Parish Council in this context.

The two-way junction proposed for Gosden Hill Village does not resolve the problems of Burpham and will add road traffic to the neighbouring communities of both Merrow and West Clandon.

CPRE does not believe that the proposal to add a new railway station at Merrow is a practicable proposition given the presence of existing stops in both Clandon and London Road.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds we believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement (see also below).

We object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon-a road which is already under traffic stress (see also below).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2337  Respondent: 8609217 / West Clandon Parish Council (John Stone)  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1) Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,

2) If this development proceeds, the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will again be proposed for development by the same developer who is promoting Gosden Hill.

3) The development will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford.

4) Together with the developments at Garlick’s Arch and Burnt Common there will be an almost uninterrupted ribbon of development along the A3 extending 5 miles from the centre of Guildford.

5) The development of this site will cause massive congestion in surrounding roads. It will generate many thousands of vehicle movements onto the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours.

6) The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7) The proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/4243  Respondent: 8609377 / Mr Andy White  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The should be removed from the plan as a possible housing site and the land allocated for possible use in the A3 Tunnel until such time as the viability and route of the Tunnel has been decided.

No mention has been made of a northbound route onto the A3. This would mean all traffic would go through the already congested roads of Burpham.

Very little information has been provided about the Sustainable Movement Corridor [SMC 6]. The little information provided would suggest a Dual carriageway is proposed, wherever possible, through the heart of Burpham. This is dangerous and inappropriate and would prejudice the existing residents of Burpham for the possible benefit of residents of Gosden Hill.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4530  Respondent: 8627393 / Worplesdon Parish Council (Gaynor White)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A25 Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow  Support subject to the appropriate infrastructure prior to development commencing to mitigate the impact on this part of Guildford. Land for the railway station to be secured and brought in at the earliest opportunity for the benefit of the wider community.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4201  Respondent: 8627393 / Worplesdon Parish Council (Gaynor White)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Support subject to the appropriate infrastructure prior to development commencing to mitigate the impact on this part of Guildford. Land for the railway station to be secured and brought in at the earliest opportunity for the benefit of the wider community.

Support the additional opportunities proposed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
### Comment ID: PSLPS16/4792  Respondent: 8640353 / Julian Cranwell  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

We object to policy A25 Gosden Hill. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the green belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds, we believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch, give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained. We object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below). The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

### Comment ID: PSLPS16/2372  Respondent: 8655233 / Kay Mackay  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. **POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm**

   I object to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

   The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds, I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

   It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch, give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.
The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight onto the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2295  Respondent: 8667713 / Victoria Sinnett  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

20. POLICY A25 Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data: 2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane 15 incidents
• Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close 8 incidents 2015
• 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage Three vehicles collided causing delays Surrey Fire and Rescue

2016

• 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
• 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
• 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the offslip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 8789 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices_factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is gridlocked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.
The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new onslip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the onslip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cashflow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2101  **Respondent:**  8667713  /  Victoria Sinnett  **Agent:**

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Gosden Hill development of 1700 houses. Reference to a potential link road from the development to the A247. The clear implication is for an access from the development to the A247 with enormous traffic implications for the A247.

South bound off- and on- slip roads to service the development and replace the existing off- slip road to Burpham. The only North bound access to the A3 will be via the existing slip road off Clay Lane. (See later, Burnt Common).

A 4-entry form secondary school, a primary school, a retail centre and a park and ride for up to 700 cars.

When developed, the new employment site at the north side of Gosden Hill Farm (site allocation A25) will be treated as an Office and Research & Development Strategic Employment Site (7000sq.m). This could mean several hundred employees.

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6889  Respondent: 8708545 / Nigel Wicks  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A25 - proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds there is a grave risk that the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure for development.

It would represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan puts forward no compelling evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt. .

I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: pslp172/4258  Respondent: 8708545 / Nigel Wicks  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A25 Gosden Hill Farm with its new aspiration to build approximately 2,000 homes of which a minimum of 1,700 homes will be delivered within the plan period, for the reasons set out in the submission of West Clandon Parish Council.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2148  Respondent: 8709249 / Geoff Spink  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays

Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.
2016

• 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
• 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
• 30 June 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.
The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4359  Respondent: 8709249 / Geoff Spink  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
1. **POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm**

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

**2010 –2014 from Crashmap data**

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcots Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

**2015**

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

**2016**

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.
I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.
Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1570  **Respondent:** 8726529 / Eric Palmer  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.
The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1282  **Respondent:** 8726529 / Eric Palmer  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Ref: A25 - The building of 1700 homes at Gosden Hill Farm as the additional traffic is not catered for in any infrastructural plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1198  **Respondent:** 8729313 / Lisa Wright  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

OBJECT. Greenbelt site which should be protected.

OBJECT to the destruction of farmland

OBJECT also to the impact of traffic on an already gridlocked A3, London Rd Burpham and surrounding area.

Burpham and Merrow already have shops and services.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Celdon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/286  Respondent: 8732353 / Simon Marshall  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site A25 Gosden hill farm another massive overdevelopment in the Green Belt as is site A35 Wisley airfield inappropriate and unsustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6639  Respondent: 8732993 / Michael Weber  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

• Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
• Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
• Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
• Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents
2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.
The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7075</th>
<th>Respondent: 8732993 / Michael Weber</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

• Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
• Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
• Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
• Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

• 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

• 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
• 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
• 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital  Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.
The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6255  Respondent: 8735873 / David and Gillian Allan  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:
2010–2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices Factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.
There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/4733</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8741761 / June Yorath</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1827  Respondent: 8744257 / Mary E Bridge  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan
The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow,
winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4308  **Respondent:** 8744417 / Mark & Gillie Hammersley  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development...
proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burnt common and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.
Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Cladon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010–2014 from Crashmap data

• Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
• Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
• Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
• Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

• 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

• 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
• 28 April 2016 A3 West Cladon London bound between A247 Tithebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
• 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Cladon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Cladon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Cladon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.
The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.
Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6107  Respondent: 8769793 / Laura Richards  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016
• 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
• 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
• 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constricted.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.
If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2300  Respondent: 8770177 / Phil Attwood  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. **I OBJECT** to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land: all requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.
There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4677 **Respondent:** 8770177 / Phil Attwood **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is
stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2246   Respondent: 8771233 / Ranald Mackinnon   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcots Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays

Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.
2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.
The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1979</th>
<th>Respondent: 8771233 / Ranald Mackinnon</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gosden Hill development of 1700 houses. Reference to a potential link road from the development to the A247. The clear implication is for an access from the development to the A247 with enormous traffic implications for the A247.

South bound off- and on-slip roads to service the development and replace the existing off-slip road to Burpham. The only North bound access to the A3 will be via the existing slip road off Clay Lane. (See later, Burnt Common).

A 4-entry form secondary school, a primary school, a retail centre and a park and ride for up to 700 cars.

When developed, the new employment site at the north side of Gosden Hill Farm (site allocation A25) will be treated as an Office and Research & Development Strategic Employment Site (7000sq.m). This could mean several hundred employees.

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4-way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2512  Respondent: 8771265 / H C MacKinnon  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.
The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7496</th>
<th>Respondent: 8772801 / David French</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

| Comment ID | pslp172/4563 | Respondent: 8772801 / David French | Agent: |
| Document | Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? | ( ) |
| is Sound? | ( ) |
| is Legally Compliant? | ( ) |

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon.
development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in
conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send
through to Guildford.

6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads.
The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is
stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of
cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way
junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial
vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build
two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway
England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7698  Respondent: 8787969 / K Britton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford.
Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development
proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too
narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching
Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development
from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the
Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre
of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is
too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015
• 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016
• 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
• 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
• 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital  Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.
The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4577</th>
<th>Respondent: 8787969 / K Britton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green. Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7418</th>
<th>Respondent: 8794753 / Andrew Beckett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital  Send Marsh Road
Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.
Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in
the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow
for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been
carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and
safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2211  Respondent: 8796321 / Nick Etches  Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A25 Gosden Hill Farm, in that even though housing numbers at this site on the surface seem to have
been revised slightly downward to 1700 from 2000, in actual fact the wording in Policy A25 now states ‘Approximately
2,000 homes of which a minimum of 1,700 homes will be delivered within the plan period’. This seems to be attempting
to indicate a change which in reality may not exist, and is misleading.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1402  Respondent: 8796673 / Suzanne Burroughs  Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill developement being in the Local Plan The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the
Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West
Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from
visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with
paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from
encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All
requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus
shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history
going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before
the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day
during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow,
winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/4386</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8796673 / Suzanne Burroughs</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.</th>
<th>Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7676</th>
<th>Respondent: 8797601 / David Newell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ) Is Sound? ( ) Is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

> I object to the Gosden Hill proposal. 

> I do not believe very exceptional circumstances have been shown to justify taking this site out of the Green Belt. 

> Even if the Gosden Hill development were to remain in the plan I believe the boundary should be explicitly drawn so as to prevent it from being visible from West Clandon. In addition development should be conditional on the A3 improvements and new railway station.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7694</th>
<th>Respondent: 8798753 / Jane Reeves Newell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ) Is Sound? ( ) Is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the Gosden Hill proposal.
I do not believe very exceptional circumstances have been shown to justify taking this site out of the Green Belt.

Even if the Gosden Hill development were to remain in the plan I believe the boundary should be explicitly drawn so as to prevent it from being visible from West Clandon. In addition development should be conditional on the A3 improvements and new railway station.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3446  **Respondent:** 8798849 / David Williams  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcots Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road
Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.
Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1958  Respondent: 8798849 / David Williams  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• Gosden Hill development of 1700 houses. Reference to a potential link road from the development to the A247. The clear implication is for an access from the development to the A247 with enormous traffic implications for the A247.

• South bound off- and on- slip roads to service the development and replace the existing off- slip road to Burpham. The only North bound access to the A3 will be via the existing slip road off Clay Lane. (See later, Burnt Common).

• A 4-entry form secondary school, a primary school, a retail centre and a park and ride for up to 700 cars.

• When developed, the new employment site at the north side of Gosden Hill Farm (site allocation A25) will be treated as an Office and Research & Development Strategic Employment Site (7000sq.m). This could mean several hundred employees.

• I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.

• There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

• Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,

• The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity

• The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

• The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

• I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

• The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1333  **Respondent:** 8798881 / H L Cousins  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.
The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford. The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement putting pedestrians at risk. Note that young families use the pavement to access Clandon school and everyday during rush hour traffic they put their lives in danger as no workable traffic calming measures have been implemented that prevent vehicles from mounting the pavement to pass each other at pinch points in the road or to manage the excessive speed of vehicles passing through the village.

I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with...
paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

A new en-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England's requirement of 2km. Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4499</th>
<th>Respondent: 8801505 / Paul Edwards</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4542  Respondent: 8801665 / Charlotte Edwards  Agent: 8801665 / Charlotte Edwards

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPFF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---


Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the alteration of the boundary of the Green Belt so as to exclude this site of 89 hectares, the existing use of which is farmland and to the allocation for 1300 houses and 700 flats.
The exceptional circumstances required under NPPF para 83 for alteration of the Green Belt boundary are not identified in the Policy A25. Under the Introduction to Policy P2 : Green Belt it is stated, "4.3.16 ... We consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify the amendment of Green Belt boundaries in order to facilitate the development that is needed and promote sustainable patterns of development. 4.3.17 Whilst the general extent of the Green Belt has been retained, land has been removed from the Green Belt in order to enable development around Guildford urban area ..."

Apart from these assertions no details are given of the circumstances said to exist in relation to the site or to those covered by Policies A43 and A43a unless these are hidden in the evidence base.

The revisions on 6 October 2014 to the National Planning Policy Guide ("NPPG") state that the NPPF should be read as a whole and that "need alone is not the only factor to be considered when drawing up a Local Plan". The NPPF is clear that planning authorities should meet objectively assessed needs, unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole or unless specific policies in the NPPF indicate that development should be restricted. Such policies include land designated as Green Belt. The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment should under the NPPG take account of constraints such as the Green Belt. If this has been done, it is not apparent. This is notwithstanding that at page 154 of the Regulation 18 Consultation Statement it is stated, "We therefore do need to consider each site on its own merits within this overall balancing act."

The failure to specify the circumstances for excluding sites from the Green Belt prevents the "meaningful and proactive engagement" of the community required under NPPF para 155.

The exclusion of Gosden Hill Farm from the Green Belt has the effect of extending the sprawl of Guildford, a large built-up area, and extends the ribbon development along the old Portsmouth Road (B2215) from the old gates to Ockham Park on the north side of Ripley, through Ripley, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and the area around Ewbank's, to Burpham and Guildford, which ribbon development has very small open spaces apart from Gosden Hill itself and the land around Garlick's Arch copse. It does the very reverse of safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

In spite of the station envisaged as Guildford East (Merrow) and the Park and Ride site the development allocated under Policy A25 including the strategic employment site will inevitably add to the already excessive traffic through West Clandon.

Policy A25 is not legally compliant for the reasons set out in my comments on question 2. Policy A25 is not sound for the reasons set out in my comments on question 3.

My answers to Question 4 apply to Policy A25.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
No details are given even now of the exceptional circumstances view NPPF for altering the Green Belt boundary to exclude A25. No consideration appears to have been given to the traffic impact on the A247 in Clandon which remains part of the Green Belt; the additional traffic would be an encroachment on the Green Belt and its openness, see Legoland Windsor Park Ltd v Windsor and Maidenhead RBC [2016] PAD 6 and R (Newsmith stainless Ltd) v Secretary of State [2001] ENHC Admin 74

The changes to the 2016 plan are so exclusive and inadequately explained that the limitation on comments permitted makes the consultation almost valueless.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

A proper map should be provided for A25 if only to show clearly the surrounding roads; the map at p391 is wholly inadequate.

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1258  **Respondent:** 8806849 / Roland McKinney  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )

Firstly, I want to pint out that this site is not in the Guildford urban area, it is a Green Belt site, as is Blackwell farm, which is also listed as being in Guildford's urban area. this is untrue.

Development on this site will cause great harm to the Green Belt, and as has been made clear, housing need alone does not permit Green Belt boundary changes.

There will also be an increase in road traffic associated with this development and an increase in air pollution. My attachment provides more details.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2383  **Respondent:** 8810113 / Louise Stewart  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. **POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm**

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.
It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.
The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burapham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7483</th>
<th>Respondent: 8810849 / Charles Lee</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.
If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4458   Respondent: 8810849 / Charles Lee   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays

Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.
No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5983</th>
<th>Respondent: 8812833 / Simon P Hill</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to site A25 Gosden Hill Farm. This is a massive over development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2347</th>
<th>Respondent: 8813409 / P Trusler</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This letter is regarding the proposed developments in the Parish of West Clandon. Namely Gosden Hill, Burntcommon and 4 way A3 Junction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have been residents of West Clandon for twenty three years. We moved to this village because of its rural location and we would be very disappointed to see West Clandon lose its village atmosphere and become a suburb of Guildford. One of the attractions of the local area for residents and tourists is the concept of an historic town like Guildford surrounded by quaint and attractive villages. It would be such a shame to see the area become a sprawling metropolis. Environmentally and aesthetically it would be a crime to destroy the green belt. Also any dent to the Green Belt philosophy is harmful. Small or large or least painful it does not matter as it can only lead down the slippery path, ie where would it end?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The main criticism that can be made about West Clandon is the traffic on the main road running through the village on the A247. West Clandon Road is a narrow two lane road and both lorries and cars hurtle down the road at high speeds. Our house literally shakes on occasions. There is a very narrow section of the road where we are frequently forced up onto the curb by oncoming traffic on the opposite side. Our car has been damaged by being side-swiped at this narrow section. The increase in vehicles that would occur should any of the proposed developments take place would be devastating to the local community resulting in more traffic jams, pollution and risk to human life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In addition any development would place a burden on existing services in the parish such as rubbish collection and general maintenance of the village to name a few problem areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We understand that Central Government may feel that they have to pressurise local authorities to increase the building of homes and schools and a travellers site but the impact of such developments in the local community is immense.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For this reason we sincerely hope that the proposed developments will be considered in light of the impact on the existing community and the proposals denied.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you for your consideration of our concerns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4788</th>
<th>Respondent: 8813409 / P Trusler</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4547  Respondent: 8813505 / Peter Grimble  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1343  Respondent: 8813601 / Gaenor Richards  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT strongly to the Gosden Hill development (A25) being in the Local Plan at all. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. These are all requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the Doomsday Book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is already stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, 62215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day (potentially threatening the lives of the village's residents and children walking to school) and through Send and Ripley which are also already severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham's sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England's requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an "aspiration" in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and on the A3.
Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4721  **Respondent:** 8813601 / Gaenor Richards  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

C.i. Policy 25 Gosden Hill – My Objections

1. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
2. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
3. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
4. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
6. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
7. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
8. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4923  **Respondent:** 8817121 / Celia Howard  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2789  Respondent: 8817953 / Sheena Ewen  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan The land in Gosden Hill currently does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon and other villages and gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. These are all requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of the Gosden Hill development is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

While no connection is currently shown between Gosden Hill and A247 (save an already overloaded A3) the developer will almost certainly seek to introduce such a connection and bring major new traffic into the village and the problematic A247.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an aspirational A3 tunnel to bypass Guildford. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will add to the burden on to the A3 which is already stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100 through Burpham, B2215 through Ripley and A247 through West Clandon would channel thousands of cars, delivery vehicles and construction vehicles through the narrow, winding (A247) road through West Clandon. This is already a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day.

The enhanced volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Without major as yet unplanned modifications, the existing two way north facing junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day. There is no south facing slip and traffic would needs pass through Merrow and Ladymead to access the A3 / A31 southbound. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England's requirement of 2km.

Burpham's sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost. There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a major infrastructure development.
A proposed railway station was previously rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London. This has not changed but we are more dependent than ever on motor cars to access the station.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are all developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36% of demand, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

Development and improvement of the A3 is not even slated to start until after 2020. The building of a tunnel, which is only an "aspiration" in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill and may have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7385</th>
<th>Respondent: 8818625 / Beth and Frank Fuller</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016
Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.
If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2085  Respondent: 8819457 / Howard Turner  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A 25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I have previously objected to the previous intention to construct 2,000 homes on this site and consider that the new Plan's proposal to reduce the number of dwellings to 1,700 homes would not materially reduce the very detrimental impact that the scheme would have upon the A3 and other local roads. I object to this revised proposal on the grounds that the number of houses proposed or this area is still far too high and, unless the development is totally concealed from the A3. It would detrimentally affect the appearance of the borough as a predominately rural area.

I am very disappointed to see that despite the massive number of valid objections raised by our villages' local residents within the 2016 consultation, the Borough Council has deemed it fitting to increase the housing, Travelling/showpeople pitches and industrial development allocations in the villages despite a reduction in the borough's overall target. With the proposed proposals for 3,700 homes at (Gosden Hill Farm and Wisley airfield (Policy A35) in the immediate vicinity and the specific proposals for the villages of Send and Send Marsh/Burnt Common to accommodate an extra 500 houses, 10 travellers pitches. 7,000+ sq.m of industrial development and slip roads to the A3. I hereby strongly object to every single one of these proposals on the grounds of their severe and adverse environmental (including atmospheric pollution from the increased traffic) impact and the unjustified sacrifice of prime agricultural Green Belt land and historic woodland.

Please ensure that this letter of objections is brought to the attention of the Government's planning inspectorate and, unlike the June 2016 process, make this consultation ortho\ of its name.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6345  Respondent: 8820353 / Gillian Beaton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 – 2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from
encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Policy A25 – Gosden Hill Farm

The proposals in the draft Local Plan for Gosden Hill Farm are bound to have a serious impact on Merrow and are incomplete and premature. The MRA Executive Committee have spent a great deal of time considering these proposals with Associations and Councils in Burpham and Clandon and are agreed that this development should not be in the Local Plan at all as it is a key area of the Green Belt around Guildford which in turn is intended to prevent urban sprawl and to safeguard the countryside from encroachment.

We are reminded that the landowners applied for outline planning consent for homes, industrial units, a railway station, a new rail bridge and a perimeter road in 1982 and 1984 and the application was refused by GBC and went to appeal. The landowners lost the appeal in 1985. It is informative to reflect on the case put to the Inspector by experts for the Council when they said that ‘the development of the site would constitute an urban encroachment into the surrounding countryside situated within the Metropolitan Green Belt and would prejudice the long established principle of endeavouring to prevent the coalescence of settlements’ contrary to Government advice. Nothing has changed since 1985 and since the Metropolitan Green Belt was established after the Second World War. It is also informative to note that the application included a four way junction with the A3 on the site.

If Policy A25 were to be retained in the Local Plan - against our wishes - we have the following comments:-

- There is an aspirational suggestion on page 25 of the Transport June 2016 Topics paper that a tunnel might be built to relieve pressure on the A3 but we await proposals from Highways England. We are advised that any upgrading of the A3 or construction of a tunnel could not commence until at least 2021/22.

- If a tunnel were to be proposed and built it would have to have an entrance on a considerable area of land on Gosden Hill Farm. No land has been identified for this purpose but only for an A3 south bound intersection.

- We take the view that any further consideration of the development of Gosden Hill Farm should be held back until the plans of Highways England are known for the A3 as it would be ridiculous to go ahead with the plans for the development of this site and for utilising land close to the A3 that might be required for an A3 tunnel.

- We are absolutely clear that there must be a four way junction with the A3 on the Gosden Hill Farm site north of Potters Lane. Unless such a junction is in place the development should not take place. It is totally unacceptable that traffic for London from the site will have to go into and through Burpham to join the A3 to go north. Burpham is already a traffic hot spot and is frequently swamped with traffic and this additional traffic and the traffic from the new Slyfield development would make the situation in Burpham chaotic and totally unacceptable to everyone that lives in or needs to have access to Burpham. Put another way the existing road structure in Burpham couldn’t cope with this additional traffic - in all honesty traffic congestion in Burpham, at times, is quite awful now as many residents of Merrow know only too well.

- The draft Local Plan addresses the timing of infrastructure construction at Gosden Hill Farm but the wording is woolly in Policy A25 and too loose and any developer worth his salt would drive a coach and horses through the wording. The necessary infrastructure must be built at the same time as the development and the four way junction with the A3 must be open before the first house is occupied. Preferably the infrastructure should be in place before the development commences but this may not be realistic.

- The wording at Policy A25 should be amended to state, in terms, that no development may commence at Gosden Hill Farm until agreement is reached for a four way junction with the A3 and no homes or retail space or the Park and Ride may be occupied or in use until the four way junction has been completed and is open.
The proposed rail station at Merrow is also an aspiration and has been for decades. The draft Local Plan is devoid of any detail nor is it clear as to where the main buildings would be erected. We could assume that they would be on the Merrow Depot site. The traffic implications with a new station at the Merrow Depot would be serious. Not only is there the increased traffic due to 2,000 new homes at Gosden Hill Farm together with a Park and Ride and two schools, there would be a large volume of additional regular, daily traffic going to and from the station. The small lane that leads up to Merrow Depot is only just wide enough for two cars and with the new, added ‘pinch points’ it is even narrower in some parts. The junction going into the lane is too small for large volumes of traffic and struggles even with the existing levels. This would cause more accidents and even longer traffic jams. The railway bridge and junction are inadequate for the new housing development let alone the addition of the anticipated additional traffic going to and from the station daily, day and night. We would also suggest that there is potential for a bus service also to be added increasing the problems. If this station were to be built, the bridge from Merrow to Burpham would have to be re-built to expand the carriageway which would be extremely costly. Whatever the GBC thoughts are on potential plans for the station, very careful consideration needs to be given to parking and access. We would suggest that separate access and parking on the Gosden Hill estate and access from there via a footbridge would ease congestion at the bridge junction leaving the lane only for access by the businesses, staff and for disabled passengers only. The other alternative would be to site the station itself on Gosden Hill Farm.

This proposed development is covered in the Burpham Neighbourhood Plan which has now been adopted and covers part of the Gosden Hill Farm site. Appendix 3 site 2 and site 3 describes the ‘Green Cathedral’ in Merrow Lane which is protected as it is common land under section 38 of the Commons Act 2006. This is the strip of land running down Merrow Lane between the Merrow Lane and Gosden Hill Farm. It does not form part of Gosden Hill Farm.

It is unfortunate that in July 2014 Network Rail used an old gateway to cross this strip of Common land to get access to and maintain their substation on the rail track. They relied on a permission that had been granted to the landowner since 1967 for the purpose of clearing the track and to improve the drainage. This detail is contained in an email from the GBC Managing Director of 9th September 2014.

The email from the Director General reads ‘With regards to the second question we have carried out a review as follows. The access track was unused for a period of twenty years. There was an existing gate that was in evidence before Network Rail entered the land and the landowner has confirmed this. The access track in question forms part of a Lease Agreement dated 16 June 1967, made between Guildford Borough Council who are the owners of the adjoining land and the then tenant. There is a line in that Lease map that clearly denotes the access track being in evidence at the time of the Lease. As part of the Lease we granted the right to the tenant and his successors in title the right to “cut and fell timber and other trees, pollards, saplings and underwood” and to “grub up underwood” in that area. Improvement works have also been carried out to the culvert that is currently there. As part of the Lease Agreement we granted the right to lay water mains etc. in that area. Therefore it seems at present we granted the right to carry out the work to clear the access track, and improve the drainage.’

Network Rail did not have consent to use this gateway but they used it nonetheless and have placed metal gates in the gateway which gives the impression that this gateway could be used to access any development that might take place at Gosden Hill Farm.

We therefore request that Policy A25 is amended to make it clear that the Common land in Merrow Lane is protected and may not be used for access to any development in Gosden Hill Farm

There is an unfortunate contradiction in this policy in that in the allocation section it is proposed that there will be both a primary and secondary school whilst in the infrastructure section it is stated that the need for a secondary school will be determined at the planning application stage. We find this totally unsatisfactory because if no secondary school is required then the size of the plot on page 181 can be reduced to the site that was proposed in the earlier draft plan removing the added area on the north east of the site.

All in all, it is impossible to support the proposals for this site not least because too much critical information is missing and far too much is aspirational and has to be taken on trust.
• We object to Policy A25 as it is unsound and has not been positively prepared for the very many reasons described above.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/2745</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8825057 / Merrow Residents' Association (Keith Meldrum)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( No ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• We set out extensive and strong objections to the Gosden Hill Farm proposals in our response to the 2016 draft Guildford Local Plan, covering both general and specific concerns. In our view, these concerns have not been adequately addressed in the changes made in this version and so continue to stand as a critical part of the overall submission for the Inspectors' review. The additional comments from the MRA on this Plan now focus on the changes bought forward and should be read in conjunction with previous comments.

• We find it extremely difficult to make any definitive comment on many aspects of this policy since there is so little detail currently available. All internal design, infrastructure and transport connections for the Gosden Hill Farm site remain open - so are both impossible to sensibly comment on and a continuing area of risk. Increased reliance on the developer to cover major costs for infrastructure including the Sustainable Movement Corridor, A3, Park and Ride and Merrow Station adds additional risk – both on the timing and the completeness of the necessary infrastructure delivery and that so much of the proposed development is now to be funded by the developer. This underscores the need for more detail to appear in the policy so that the developer cannot wriggle out of his obligations at any planning application stage.

• In the context that Policy A25 has been retained, in our view quite inappropriately, we make the following comments on the revisions:

• We note the new requirement for a minimum of 1700 homes during the Plan period. Given the uncertainties around growth projections over a period of this length, the recognised economic challenges from Brexit and other UK macroeconomic circumstances and the still open questions over the local housing need, we recommend that this rate of development must be reviewed and challenged periodically through the plan period. The rate of housing growth contained within the revised Plan remains very high and gives great concern for the sustainable development and maintenance of the current Guildford way of life without significant detriment.

• In addition, we must comment that although the number of new homes to be built has been reduced during the lifetime of this Plan that there is a clear intention that more houses will be built on this site after the Plan period and therefore there is no real reduction in the number of houses to be built on this site. This can be quite properly described as a smoke and mirrors presentation which fools no one.

• We made some very specific comments in the July 2016 submission reflecting the views of Richard Jarvis BSE, MS, CEng, FICE, FCIHT who is a qualified Civil Engineer. He now comments that the improvement to the A3 is obviously critically important to the Gosden Hill Farm development. We do not have the benefit of analysis of the proposed new slip roads giving access off and on to the A3 southbound carriageway nor an understanding of the implications of the Sustainable Movement Corridor for the allocation of highway capacity on the local roads. What is self-evident is that the pressure on local roads in Burpham is already intense in peak periods, and these roads are clearly not suited to carrying large volumes of traffic. Under the Plan, congestion is very likely to be worse than today. The proposed Policy A24 Slyfield development will also add demands on the A320 and roads in Jacob’s Well.

• We strongly support the recognition and explicit requirement to improve the A3 road junction and connection to the Gosden Hill Farm site. However, this covers only the southbound carriageway and still leaves the new development very inaccessible either off or onto the northbound carriageway. This makes very little sense and feels like shortterm planning
for this very significant development. This can only exacerbate the already well recognised traffic pressures in the area. We believe that the Gosden Hill Farm development should only go ahead with a four-way junction connection to the A3; and that this should be part of the explicit pre-planning required as the preconditions for the development. This would seem to us to be an absolute fundamental element of the Local Plan.

• The proposal for a 7000-sq. m strategic HQ building further highlights the necessity for good connections to the site and provides additional support to our recommendation of a four-way junction with the A3.

• It is clear that there is a high early dependency on Highways England for A3 improvements. It is also clear that all the strategic development sites (Blackwell Farm, Gosden Hill Farm, Slyfield, Garlick’s Arch and Wisley airfield) are on or close to the A3 and the Sustainable Movement Corridor. Given that the first is already under strain and that the second does not exist, this suggests that all the strategic housing development sites are fundamentally dependent on these major road infrastructure enhancements.

• Our previous objections to the severe impact of the Gosden Hill Farm development to surrounding communities (Burpham, Merrow, Clandon, Send, etc.) still stand. We appreciate that the housing figure has been spread over a longer period of time with the slower housing ramp up but this doesn’t reduce our real concern about the severe traffic congestion that will flow from the development of Gosden Hill Farm.

• As previously stated above in relation to Policy P2, the NPPF is clear that local planning authorities should, through their Local Plans, meet objectively assessed needs unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole, or specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted. We take the view that the benefits related to the development of Gosden Hill Farm do not outweigh the harm to the Green Belt that would follow and that the Council have made an error of judgement by including Policy A25 in this draft local Plan.

• We must also return to a topical issue in this response related to common land in Merrow Lane bordering Gosden Hill Farm which was covered in our July 2016 submission. There was an overgrown gateway about 100 metres from the railway line in Merrow Lane which we understand was the subject of an agreement between GBC and the landowner. Network Rail used that gateway without legal authority in 2014 to access and cross Gosden Hill Farm to upgrade their electricity substation and subsequently have replaced the gateway with a modern new galvanized gate instead of returning the gateway to its original state as required by Guildford Borough Council. A dispute continues between the Burpham Community and Guildford Borough Council on this matter and the landowner has indicated that he wishes the existing gate to be retained rather than being replaced with more appropriate post and rails fencing. We need to make our position clear in that this access point from Merrow Lane into Gosden Hill Farm across common land does not amount to a public right of way and we shall resist any proposal to use this gateway as an access point of any nature to Gosden Hill Farm at any time in the future.

• We object to Policy A25 for the reasons explained above. The policy is unsound and if it is to be retained in the Local Plan must include a four-way junction onto the A3. If no four-way junction is to be provided then there should be no development at Gosden Hill Farm - this being the publically stated view of members of the Guildford Borough Council Executive Committee.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object specifically to proposed building on Gosden Hill Farm on Green Belt designated to prevent West Clandon being absorbed into a sprawling urban environment four times the size of the village it blights.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2509  Respondent: 8826081 / Simon Wilcockson   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was intended to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.
The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6401  Respondent: 8826369 / Tim Madge  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

---
• 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016
• 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
• 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
• 30 June 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools. Currently, a two-way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.
The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime, given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4392  Respondent: 8826369 / Tim Madge  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
1. **POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm**

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.
I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.
Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4680  Respondent: 8827777 / Mary English  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1414  Respondent: 8827809 / Robert Wood  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.
The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Glandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Glandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of Wet Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data: 2010 -2014 from Crashmap data

- Glandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents 2015
- 21 Oct 2015 - P:2.47 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays

Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street - P:2.47 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Glandon London bound between P:2.47 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Glandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the P:2.47 through West Glandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Glandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.
The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Glandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham's sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Glandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Glandon towards East Glandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England's requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an 'aspiration' in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Glandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010–2014 from Crashmap data

* Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
* Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
* Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
* Tithebarns Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

  
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

* 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
* 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burnt Common and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
* 30 June 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until the A3 reaches the A320 Stock Road.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow,
winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
landowners lost the appeal in 1985. The case put to the Inspector by the Council’s expert representatives said that ‘the development of the site would constitute an urban encroachment into the surrounding countryside situated within the Metropolitan Green Belt and would prejudice the long established principle of endeavouring to prevent the coalescence of settlements’ contrary to Government advice. Nothing has changed in this respect since 1985 and before that since the Metropolitan Green Belt was established after the Second World War. It is also interesting to note that the application included a four way junction with the A3 on the site.

If Gosden Hill Farm were to be retained in the Local Plan, I have the following comments:-

There is a suggestion that a tunnel **might** be built to relieve pressure on the A3. Proposals are awaited from Highways England. Any upgrading of the A3 or construction of a tunnel would and could not be constructed until the 2020’s at the earliest. If a tunnel were to be built it would probably have to have an entrance on a considerable area of land on Gosden Hill Farm. No land has been identified for this purpose but only for an A3 south bound intersection. Any further consideration of the development of Gosden Hill Farm should be postponed until the plans of Highways England are known for the A3.

There should be a four way junction with the A3 on the Gosden Hill Farm site. Unless such a junction is in place the development should not take place. It is totally unacceptable for traffic for London from the site having to go into and through Burpham to join the A3 to go north. Burpham is already a congested traffic hot spot and is frequently overwhelmed by traffic. Additional traffic from this site and additional traffic to and from the new Slyfield development would make the situation in Burpham impossible and totally unacceptable to everyone who currently needs access to and through Burpham.

The wording in the draft Local Plan dealing with the timing of infrastructure construction at Gosden Hill Farm is too vague and a licence for developers to manoeuvre round it to the detriment of local residents. The necessary infrastructure must be built at the same time as the development and the four way junction with the A3 must be open before any houses are occupied.

The proposed rail station at Merrow is also an aspiration and has been for decades. The draft Local Plan is devoid of any detail nor is it clear as to where the main buildings would be erected. If they are to be on the present Merrow Depot site, the traffic implications would be serious. Not only would there be increased traffic from 2,000 new homes at Gosden Hill Farm, there would be a large volume of additional regular, daily traffic going to and from the station. The small lane that leads up to Merrow Depot is inadequate and the junction going into the lane is too small for large volumes of traffic and struggles even with existing levels. The railway bridge and junction are inadequate for the new housing development let alone the addition of the anticipated additional traffic going to and from the station daily, day and night. There is potential for a bus service also to be added increasing the problems.

This proposed development is covered in part by the Burpham Neighbourhood Plan. Appendix 3 site 2 and site 3 describes the ‘Green Cathedral’ in Merrow Lane which is protected as it is common land. This strip of land running down Merrow Lane between the Merrow Lane and Gosden Hill Farm does not form part of Gosden Hill Farm. It should therefore be made clear that the common land in Merrow Lane is protected and may not be used for access to any development on Gosden Hill Farm.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7643</th>
<th>Respondent: 8831393 / John Dumbleton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POLICY A25 – GOSDEN HILL FARM**
The proposals in the draft Local Plan for Gosden Hill Farm would have a serious adverse impact on Merrow and not just Burpham itself. This development should not be in the Local Plan as it is a key area of the Green Belt around Guildford.

I am aware that the landowners applied for outline planning consent for homes, industrial units, a railway station, a new rail bridge and a perimeter road in 1982 and 1984 and the application was refused by GBC and went to appeal. The landowners lost the appeal in 1985. The case put to the Inspector by the Council’s expert representatives said that ‘the development of the site would constitute an urban encroachment into the surrounding countryside situated within the Metropolitan Green Belt and would prejudice the long established principle of endeavouring to prevent the coalescence of settlements’ contrary to Government advice. Nothing has changed in this respect since 1985 and before that since the Metropolitan Green Belt was established after the Second World War. It is also interesting to note that the application included a four way junction with the A3 on the site.

If Gosden Hill Farm were to be retained in the Local Plan, I have the following comments:—

There is a suggestion that a tunnel might be built to relieve pressure on the A3. Proposals are awaited from Highways England. Any upgrading of the A3 or construction of a tunnel would and could not be constructed until the 2020’s at the earliest. If a tunnel were to be built it would probably have to have an entrance on a considerable area of land on Gosden Hill Farm. No land has been identified for this purpose but only for an A3 south bound intersection. Any further consideration of the development of Gosden Hill Farm should be postponed until the plans of Highways England are known for the A3.

There should be a four way junction with the A3 on the Gosden Hill Farm site. Unless such a junction is in place the development should not take place. It is totally unacceptable for traffic for London from the site having to go into and through Burpham to join the A3 to go north. Burpham is already a congested traffic hot spot and is frequently overwhelmed by traffic. Additional traffic from this site and additional traffic to and from the new Slyfield development would make the situation in Burpham impossible and totally unacceptable to everyone who currently needs access to and through Burpham.

The wording in the draft Local Plan dealing with the timing of infrastructure construction at Gosden Hill Farm is too vague and a licence for developers to manoeuvre round it to the detriment of local residents. The necessary infrastructure must be built at the same time as the development and the four way junction with the A3 must be open before any houses are occupied.

The proposed rail station at Merrow is also an aspiration and has been for decades. The draft Local Plan is devoid of any detail nor is it clear as to where the main buildings would be erected. If they are to be on the present Merrow Depot site, the traffic implications would be serious. Not only would there be increased traffic from 2,000 new homes at Gosden Hill Farm, there would be a large volume of additional regular, daily traffic going to and from the station. The small lane that leads up to Merrow Depot is inadequate and the junction going into the lane is too small for large volumes of traffic and struggles even with existing levels. The railway bridge and junction are inadequate for the new housing development let alone the addition of the anticipated additional traffic going to and from the station daily, day and night. There is potential for a bus service also to be added increasing the problems.

This proposed development is covered in part by the Burpham Neighbourhood Plan. Appendix 3 site 2 and site 3 describes the ‘Green Cathedral’ in Merrow Lane which is protected as it is common land This strip of land running down Merrow Lane between the Merrow Lane and Gosden Hill Farm does not form part of Gosden Hill Farm. It should therefore be made clear that the common land in Merrow Lane is protected and may not be used for access to any development on Gosden Hill Farm.

Too much critical information is missing from this proposal and far too much is aspirational and therefore has to be taken on trust which I am not prepared to do.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The proposed development at Burpham should not be built because:

1. The site is totally within the Green Belt.
2. The Road access on to the A 3 is unlikely to be constructed by the Government. Further, The Developers have not given any evidence of their willingness to pay for the said access or the construction of a New Railway Station.
3. The Development at Burpham on the proposed scale, which is Green Belt Land, is going to destroy the villages of both Burpham and Merrow. Plus, Increasing the volume of traffic on feeder roads that are already overcrowded.
4. How can the Borough approve development on Green Belt without Central Government Policy changing? The Local M P’s have stated that there has been No Change in the current administration’s attitude. The construction of any building on Green Belt Land is therefore Illegal. Which has recently been confirmed by the relevant Minister.
5. Once again the current Council has felt fit to rail road their predecessor’s original proposals, for a Draft Plan, without proper consideration of the local residents wishes.
6. The Plan has not taken the Referendum Vote, Namely the Country’s wish to substantially reduce the number of immigrants to Great Britain, into account.
7. With a new Leader of the Government, the Country’s Housing Policy is likely to change dramatically, therefore this Draft Plan should at the very least be cancelled until the Central Government Minister reviews the Housing Policy for the South of England.
8. The Councillors heading the now revamped scheme, were not acting in the interests of the Residents, and must have been aware of its unpopularity. Further they have not taken into account the views of the Borough’s M.P.s
9. The Current Counsellors like this Draft Plan can be removed. For the heart felt felling of the Residents of the Neighbourhoods within the area of the Draft Plan is total hostility. Which will be reflected in the Next Ballot Box.
10. This Draft Plan is a Total Waste of Rate Payer’s Money; I believe the councillors should be ashamed.
11. The development of the former Wisley Aerodrome site has already been turned down, which was far less intrusive, to both adjoining residents and access roads, than the latest Guildford Borough Draft Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.
The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools. Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham's sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost. There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at burnt Common which is against Highway England's requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an "aspiration" in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

10) I OBJECT to policy change at A25 Gosden Hill Farm

I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon and Send from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the three to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds it will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is already stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon and Send.

I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below). The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3476  Respondent: 8839553 / David Burnett  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon and Send from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the three to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds it will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is already stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding A247 road through West Clandon and Send.
I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below). The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km minimum distance.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm**

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see above and below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained. To allow this would be plain irresponsible.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.
If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2011  Respondent: 8840033 / Jimmy Daboo  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Gosden Hill development of 1,700 houses. Reference to a potential link road from the development to the A247. The clear implication is for an access from the development to the A247 with enormous traffic implications for the A247.

South bound off- and on-slip roads to service the development and replace the existing off-slip road to Burpham. The only North bound access to the A3 will be via the existing slip road off Clay Lane. (See later, Burnt Common).

A 4-entry form secondary school, a primary school, a retail centre and a park and ride for up to 700 cars.

When developed, the new employment site at the north side of Gosden Hill Farm (site allocation A25) will be treated as an Office and Research & Development Strategic Employment Site (7,000sq.m). This could mean several hundred employees.

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1,700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2297  Respondent: 8840353 / Brendan McWilliams  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

B.i. Policy A25 – My Objections

1) Gosden Hill development of 1700 houses. Reference to a potential link road from the development to the A247. The clear implication is for an access from the development to the A247 with enormous traffic implications for the A247.
2) South bound off- and on- slip roads to service the development and replace the existing off- slip road to Burpham. The only North bound access to the A3 will be via the existing slip road off Clay Lane. (See later, Burnt Common).
3) A 4-entry form secondary school, a primary school, a retail centre and a park and ride for up to 700 cars.
4) When developed, the new employment site at the north side of Gosden Hill Farm (site allocation A25) will be treated as an Office and Research & Development Strategic Employment Site (7000sq.m). This could mean several hundred employees.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8131  Respondent: 8843361 / Adrian Atkinson  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A25 Gosden Hill There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the green belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/993</th>
<th>Respondent: 8848033 / Paul Gerrard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to any development of this site. It is within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, and therefore any development, especially for housing, is subject to EU/UK legislation (NPPF 119). The impact cannot be mitigated with SANGs because there is no evidence base to support SANGs as required by NRM6 viii, NPPF 158 and 166.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's Green Belt (NPPF 89).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s next to a SNCI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's largely agricultural land, which is an important national resource for food provision, and will become increasingly so, the loss of which the government is supposedly keen to minimize (NPPF 112).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3025</th>
<th>Respondent: 8854785 / Desmond McCann</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the hiding of development by &quot;deferment&quot; (A24, A25, A26, A43) This version of the Plan has concealed some development planned to take place by &quot;deferring&quot; it beyond the period covered by the Local Plan. This is designed to have 2 effects:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I) to hide the number of housed actually being built (A24, A25, A26 - total of 1100 deferred, but still being built!) , and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) give an excuse for building houses on another site (A43 - 400/650 houses proposed) when they are not needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1014</th>
<th>Respondent: 8855201 / Catherine Harding</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to development on this site for the following reasons:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will have an adverse impact on the biodiversity and conservation of ancient woodlands of Cotts wood and Frithys Wood and an area of wetland.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local people will suffer a loss of amenity provided by the above woodlands and a loss of view over Gosden Hill Farm and Dedwell Manor Farm.

The trains to London are already too crowded. From experience I know that commuter services are "standing and crowded" before 07.00. The situation will become far worse by building more large executive houses to attract people who already work in London rather than building houses to help people who are waiting for a home on the housing list, which is what the area needs.

A development here will make the roads more crowded as well.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/4380</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8855649 / John Coleman</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
1. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, giving Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham's sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.
If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England's requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an "aspiration" in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to policy A25 Gosden Hill

There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

Gosden Hill is located entirely within the green belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.

The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds we believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4-way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4302  **Respondent:** 8858113 / Ramsey Nagaty  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

19 POLICY A25 GOSDEN HILL

19.1 I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.

19.2 There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

19.3 Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,

19.4 The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity

19.5 The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green. Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

19.6 The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

19.7 I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

19.8 The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

19.9 A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
### Comment ID: PSLPS16/5169  Respondent: 8858881 / Stephen Meredith  Agent:

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm. The Green Belt serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford and Gosden Hill Farm currently provides a green buffer and gives Burpham a defined green boundary. The Plan fails to provide any evidence that any exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement. The scale of development proposed at Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon being four times the size of the existing village. The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

I strongly object to the proposal for a 4 way junction at Burnt Common. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km. This junction would have the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow roads through West Clandon, Send and Ripley. The additional traffic will also greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

### Comment ID: PSLPS16/4949  Respondent: 8862465 / Nik Church  Agent:

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

### Comment ID: PSLPS16/5703  Respondent: 8865537 / P Waldner  Agent:

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

20. POLICY A25- Gosden Hill Farm
I object to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data: 2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents 2015
- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays

Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.
Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight onto the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which raise health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4590</th>
<th>Respondent: 8865985 / Grant Ringshaw</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.

4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.

5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/677</th>
<th>Respondent: 8875233 / Richard Hiam</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Green Belt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.
The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2077  Respondent:  8875233 / Richard Hiam  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Gosden Hill development of 1700 houses. Reference to a potential link road from the development to the A247. The clear implication is for an access from the development to the A247 with enormous traffic implications for the A247.

South bound off- and on- slip roads to service the development and replace the existing off- slip road to Burpham. The only North bound access to the A3 will be via the existing slip road off Clay Lane. (See later, Burnt Common).

A 4-entry form secondary school, a primary school, a retail centre and a park and ride for up to 700 cars.
When developed, the new employment site at the north side of Gosden Hill Farm (site allocation A25) will be treated as an Office and Research & Development Strategic Employment Site (7000sq.m). This could mean several hundred employees.

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads.
   The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is
   stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of
   cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way
   junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial
   vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build
   two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway
   England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England's requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an "aspiration" in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4674  **Respondent:** 8875969 / Sean Gilchrist  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4009  Respondent: 8876257 / Peter S Cliff  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY A25; GOSDEN HILL FARM, MERROW LANE, GUILDFORD (PAGE 178)

As an addition to the two areas referred to above this proposed development would represent the merging of villages from the M25 to Guildford, leading to creeping suburbia with associated degradation of the rural nature of the existing villages in the area.

In conclusion, my further objection with reference to the sites identified above is;
Insetting of villages will make them the "sacrificial lambs" of this proposed planning process, with significant harm to air quality, increased traffic on already overcrowded roads, and attendant noise levels. There will be loss of wild-life habitat and loss of rural character in general. This proposal would cause unthinkable damage to the Conservation Area of Ripley Village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3253  Respondent: 8881345 / Lynne Ground  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.
The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 – 2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from
encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.
Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7472  Respondent: 8883841 / Pamela French  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.
The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4303  **Respondent:** 8892737 / David Eagle  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**I OBJECT** to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
• Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
• Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
• Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

• 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

• 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
• 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
• 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.
Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/4629</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8892737 / David Eagle</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

C.i. Policy 25 Gosden Hill – My Objections

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green. Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is
stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7656  **Respondent:** 8893057 / Dianne Garnett  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

---

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1.1 **We object** to policy A25 Gosden Hill

1.2 There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

1.3 Gosden Hill is located entirely within the green belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.

1.4 The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.

1.5 The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

1.6 The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

1.7 We object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

1.8 The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

1.9 A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5991</th>
<th>Respondent: 8896097 / Andrew Fordham</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

20. POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:
2010 – 2014 from Crashmap data Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents
2015
21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.
2016
15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road
Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the
sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development. The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants. The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km. Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight onto the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2137  Respondent: 8897377 / Jan Jewers  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

11. I object to A25 Gosden Hill Farm site of over 2000 homes, this is a massive overdevelopment in Green Belt and will cause congestion on the trunk roads A3/M25.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1719  Respondent: 8899489 / A.A. White  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the removal of 89 ha. of Green Belt at Gosden Hill Farm. This valuable farmland is desperately needed to help reduce the need for imported fresh foodstuffs. Despite the suggested road improvements the development proposal will, without doubt, have a detrimental effect on the existing areas of Burpham and Merrow. The "Allocation" box in
Policy statement A25 clearly shows, without any doubt, how Guildford Borough Council supports the environmental Armageddon of this part of the Borough. Adding together all the proposed uses, it is absolutely obvious that the Burpham area will be a place to avoid. Congestion caused by housing, schools, shopping, general employment, Park and Ride and other proposals will add to the traffic nightmare current on the A3.

To put it simply, wasn't the A3 improved to REMOVE traffic from peripheral villages?

Perhaps you have forgotten!

Finally, perhaps you will be able to explain to the Public Inquiry Inspector why Guildford Borough Council is encouraging developers to progress housing proposals as soon as possible. Could it be that Guildford Borough Council is attempting a series of "fait accompli" in advance of any Inspector's decision?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3752  Respondent: 8899713 / Tessa Crago  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents2015
- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays

Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.
2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 June 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools. Currently, a two-way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.
If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime, given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/5412  Respondent: 8899713 / Tessa Crago   Agent: 

Document:   Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

C.i. Policy 25 Gosden Hill

1. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt

2. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

3. The development of this site will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

4. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress.

5. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

6. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which I understand is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1995  Respondent: 8900705 / Susan Fuller   Agent: 

Document:   Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime, given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.
Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4476  Respondent: 8900705 / Susan Fuller  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

C.i. Policy 25 Gosden Hill – My Objections

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4482  Respondent: 8901217 / Chris Fuller  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
C.i. Policy 25 Gosden Hill – My Objections

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1915  Respondent: 8901633 / Duncan Gray  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

20. POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.
The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data: 2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays Surrey Fire and Rescue

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development. The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4413  Respondent: 8901633 / Duncan Gray  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in
conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3948  **Respondent:** 8901953 / I.G. Howell  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Burnt Common and Gosden Hill Farm

The former was removed from the previous consultation on the grounds of the 'merging of settlements' provision. If the provision applied to that site then why does it not apply to the Gosden Hill Farm site? A Ewbank’s (brown field) site development would constitute a more satisfactory solution for housing than Garlick's Arch, without the need for massive infrastructure changes.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/8230  **Respondent:** 8903265 / Susan Anderson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

**2010 – 2014 from Crashmap data**

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarns Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

**2015**

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

**2016**

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until the A3 reaches the A320 Stock Road.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.
The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4638  Respondent: 8903265 / Susan Anderson  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.  
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,  
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
• Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015
• 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  
Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016
• 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
• 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
• 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.
The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Note the following accident data:

2010 – 2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
- Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.
Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6898  Respondent: 8905537 / Christopher Ross  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.
The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010–2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays

  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1686  Respondent: 8906177 / Peter & Robyn Cormack  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object most strongly and specifically to the proposed building on Gosden Hill Farm on Green Belt designated to prevent West Clandon being subsumed into an urban sprawl. The proposed development would, at this stage, be four times greater than the village of West Clandon, and I have no doubts whatsoever that, that if housing development is allowed on this site, the housing numbers will increase as a precedent has been set. I object to West Clandon being blighted quite unnecessarily.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisle Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.
No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the Doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.
Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4656  Respondent: 8906305 / Anne Fort  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6008  Respondent: 8908513 / Burpham Community Association (Liz Critchfield)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
This proposes a development of 2000 homes, eight traveller pitches, employment and retail space, community services, two schools, a Park and Ride for up to 1000 vehicles and a railway station at Merrow. It is the one specific scheme that will have most impact on Burpham and our immediate neighbours and we strongly object to it for the following reasons:

- The proposal will put thousands more vehicles on to already very congested roads.

- Access to the development is by a new A3 southbound off/on slip road north of the current slip road to Burpham and Merrow which will become two way. This means that all the traffic from Gosden Hill Village and the Park and Ride wanting to access the north bound A3 or the B2234/A25/A246 will have to travel through Burpham. The SHAR admits that there will be an increase in traffic through Burpham and there will be pressure on the A3100/B2234 roundabout. This is already a notorious pinch point, jammed to the point of gridlock at peak times. We hear much of the cost to business caused by congestion, yet this Plan seeks to compound Burpham’s traffic problems.

- The new junction will be 1.8km from the southbound on slip at Burnt Common, thus failing to meet Highways England requirements of 2km between on-then-off junctions.

- The policy notes “Any proposals for the development of this site should have regard to the potential opportunity to provide an all movements junction of the A3 trunk road with the A3100 London Road, the B2215 London Road and the A247 Clandon Road. This could form part of the proposals for Highways England’s emerging A3 Guildford scheme for which construction is anticipated to commence in Road Period 2 (2020/21 to 2024/25) as required by the department for Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy.” Words like “should …potential… could… anticipated” are conditional; any development of this magnitude requires a firm commitment to provide all the necessary infrastructure. The original 1984 proposal shows a four way junction which is essential if this development is to be realised. Furthermore, a decision has to be made about the possibility of constructing a tunnel before any development on Gosden Hill. It would be short-sighted in the extreme to build homes and all of the associated infrastructure on the most suitable land for a tunnel entrance.

- The developer is required to provide the eastern route section of the Sustainable Movement Corridor. We have already noted the impracticalities of fitting four traffic lanes in narrow roads with pinch points. If SMC 6 is instigated in its present form then running Park and Ride buses through Burpham will add to the congestion and exacerbate pollution levels.

- There is no reference to the proposed railway station in the Wessex Plan for future rail development. We note, too, that in 1984 GBC discounted the idea as they felt it would mean Gosden Hill becoming a dormitory estate for London rather than an estate for local housing need.

- The policy requires “green corridors and linkages to habitats outside of the site and the adjoining SNCI” It should be noted that the owner of the land, who is also the potential developer, objected to local green spaces and wildlife corridors adjacent to this site. (Burpham Neighbourhood Plan)

- There is a requirement in the policy to reduce surface water flood risk through appropriate mitigation. Burpham is recognised as a flooding “hot spot” and we consider it essential that a full hydrological survey be carried out before any development is contemplated.
• There is a contradiction in the requirement for a secondary school. A proposal is put forward for a primary and secondary school, but in the infrastructure section it states that the need for a secondary school will be determined at the planning application stage. This dichotomy needs to be resolved because if no secondary school is needed, the size of the development can be reduced.

In 1982 the first application to develop Gosden Hill was made. It was held that such a proposal

• would conflicted with Green Belt policy,
• was an undesirable intrusion of residential development into a rural area,
• would cause the loss of good quality rural land,
• offered insufficient infrastructure.

How interesting to note that these were some of the reasons Guildford Borough Council gave when refusing the application. The BCA contend that they are still valid.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4351</th>
<th>Respondent: 8908513 / Burpham Community Association (Liz Critchfield)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We object strongly to this policy as the changes do nothing to alleviate the concerns we expressed last year. Our reasons for objecting are as follows.

Allocation

The inference is that the number of homes has been reduced to 1,700 – this is not so. A25 states that “Approximately 2,000 homes of which a minimum of 1,700 homes will be delivered within the plan period...” So no change there then, merely sleight of hand.

Infrastructure

• Two-way junction

You refer to an “improved” junction on the A3. The map below shows clearly the devastating effects that a two-way junction will have on Burpham.

[Image]

The proposed development does not just deliver homes; there will be schools, businesses, shops, a station and a Park and Ride. This will generate a daily movement of thousands of vehicles the vast majority of which will pass through Burpham. It is charitable to assume that those who have concluded a two-way junction will suffice have no knowledge of local conditions but if they are aware, then this proposal is a cynical betrayal of Burpham residents.

For years, this village has been subjected to one poorly conceived planning application after another, with no thought given to the infrastructure needed. The last few decades have seen two major housing estates, a considerable number of smaller garden grabbing developments, one super store and, recently, one very inappropriately sited supermarket.

The result is daily road congestion that can easily lead to gridlock at peak times or when an incident on the A3 causes a southbound tailback and drivers try and escape via the Burpham exit. The traffic is made up of cars, commercial vehicles and an increasing number of HGVs, all of it pumping out high levels of pollutants – dangerously high levels when
vehicles are slow-moving or stationary. Air pollution kills and is rightly concerning national government. It should also concern GBC. How can you contemplate subjecting your residents to the increased number of vehicles that will pass – very slowly - through Burpham if this proposal goes ahead? We note under Key Considerations the phrase “Potential air quality issues.” The word potential is disingenuous.

There are further considerations; other policies, if realised, could well have an impact on Burpham’s roads. A24 Slyfield is one, especially if the Clay Lane Link Road is upgraded from its current status as Aspirational. The A35 Wisley Airfield proposal, along with the planned expansion of RHS Wisley, will add pressure on the A3, already at capacity, and therefore likely to affect Burpham roads.

- **Access to the development**

Access/egress to and from the proposed development is shown from one roundabout, serving traffic from the A3 and the A3100 which we consider unsustainable. There is apparently no other way in or out, creating in effect a box canyon. A simple accident or breakdown could block the roundabout. What will happen if there is an urgent need to get emergency vehicles into the development?

Perhaps the answer lies buried in the section headed Opportunities.

**Opportunities**

(1) Create unique places that combine the highest standards of good urban design with well-designed streets and spaces
(2) Incorporate high quality architecture that responds to the unique context of the site
(3) **Potential to provide a through route within the site to divert the B2234 to form a more direct link to the A3 at the improved junction**
(4) Create a sustainable urban extension with bus, cycle and pedestrian links into the adjoining urban area, and the town centre.

No indication is given of the location of this potential route nor is there any evidence of a protected route for this link, which is a strange omission.

Even more perplexing is the map shown below. It is taken from the Gosden Hill Vision and Development Framework published last year by Martin Grant, developer and owner of Gosden Hill Farm. It clearly shows a potential link between the site and Merrow Lane, oddly enough at the precise location of an illegal track which crosses common land and a Local Green Space (Burpham Neighbourhood Plan Policy B-En 3 Local Green Spaces), currently the subject of a formal complaint to GBC.

[Image]

Whilst we are concerned about the danger of a single access/egress to the proposed development, we would strongly object to any encroachment onto Local Green Space and the inevitable increase in traffic on already congested country lanes.

- **Sustainable Movement Corridor**

The developer is required to

“provide the eastern route section of the Sustainable Movement Corridor on the site and make a necessary and proportionate contribution to delivering the eastern route section on the Local Road Network, both having regard to the Sustainable Movement Corridor Supplementary Planning Document.”
This change, shown in red, means we can legitimately respond. This is what we said in response to the 2016 Draft Local Plan.

The proposed Sustainable Movement Corridor (SMC) cannot be delivered as the roads are too narrow and have pinch points. This certainly applies to Burpham. The A3100 London Road will become an SMC supposedly carrying north and south bound bus and cycle lanes in addition to general traffic lanes north and south bound; four lanes of traffic where only two exist at present. This suggests that someone engaged in a paper exercise without making a site visit armed with a tape measure, an unsound practice that will have a deleterious effect on our community.

Did no one listen?

- **A3 Tunnel**

In the Guildford Borough Transport Strategy 2017, we note several references to the A3 Guildford Tunnel under the Aspirations heading. Assuming aspirations means ambition not wishful thinking, there is a need for land to be identified and protected **now**. Gosden Hill is the logical site so it seems somewhat short-sighted to permit development there.

- **Green Belt**

Gosden Hill, whether a site for 1,700 or 2,000 homes, is situated entirely within the Green Belt and performs all the defined functions of the Green Belt:

  - to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas
  - to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another
  - to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
  - to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
  - to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land

The NPPF paras 87-89 requires demonstration of exceptional circumstances before building can be permitted. Nearly 60% of the total proposed new housing development will be in the Green Belt – how can this be exceptional? Furthermore, if this proposal is realised, Clandon and Guildford will be separated by a very narrow strip of land likely to come under pressure for further development. We commented last year that “the Green Belt is not the personal fiefdom of Guildford Borough Council but belongs to the wider community. . . . . . and should be regarded as a national asset and a legacy for the future. Once the Green Belt is lost it is lost in perpetuity.”

Plus ça change.

[Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998]

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

| Attached documents: | BCA_response_to_Local_Plan_2017Consultation.docx (830 KB) |

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/8195  **Respondent:** 8909761 / Diana Grover  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.
The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.
The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Gosden Hill (policy A25)

The scale of the development proposal and its potential impact on the A3 and other local roads is a major concern. The provision of a rail link may help to partially alleviate the problem, but the number of houses proposed is far higher than is suitable for the location and unless the development is invisible from the A3 then it will detrimentally affect the appearance of the borough as a predominantly rural area.

I object to the large proposed development at of 2,000 houses at Wisley Airfield, 2,000 houses at Gosden Hill and 1,850 houses at Blackwell Farm because it will destroy large areas of Green Belt and agricultural land and produce congestion on the A3 and surrounding roads including Send.

I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are targeted at the Green Belt strung along the A3 which will destroy the open amenity of the borough and produce gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A247 which are all already at 100% capacity.

I object to the complete failure of GBC to identify sufficient brownfield sites within the urban area which should be targeted first for development before the open countryside and the Green Belt and the failure to include the Town Centre Masterplan 2015 within the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6341  Respondent: 8919009 / Andrew Kukielka  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.
A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4698  
Respondent: 8919009 / Andrew Kukielka  
Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.

There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,

The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5922  Respondent: 8921377 / Paul Maycox  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.
It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Cledon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcots Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.
The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4503  Respondent: 8921377 / Paul Maycox  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.

4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.

5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6340  Respondent: 8921857 / Claire Kukielka  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:
2010 – 2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.
There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4545  **Respondent:** 8921857 / Claire Kukielka  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is
stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The scale of the development proposal and its potential impact on the A3 and other local roads is a major concern. The provision of a rail link may help to partially alleviate the problem, but the number of houses proposed is far higher than is suitable for the location and unless the development is invisible from the A3 then it will detrimentally affect the appearance of the borough as a predominantly rural area.

I object to the large proposed development at of 2,000 houses at Wisley Airfield, 2,000 houses at Gosden Hill and 1,850 houses at Blackwell Farm because it will destroy large areas of Green Belt and agricultural land and produce congestion on the A3 and surrounding roads including Send.

I object to the fact that 70% of the proposed 13,860 houses are targeted at the Green Belt strung along the A3 which will destroy the open amenity of the borough and produce gridlock on the A3 and surrounding roads including the A247 which are all already at 100% capacity.

I object to the complete failure of GBC to identify sufficient brownfield sites within the urban area which should be targeted first for development before the open countryside and the Green Belt and the failure to include the Town Centre Masterplan 2015 within the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3125  Respondent: 8924449 / Caroline Mayne  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A25 Gosden Hill:

The documents imply that there is a reduction to 1,700 new homes (from the earlier figure of 2,000). But it now appears this is misleading and that the lower figure is still a minimum. In any event, this scale of new homes planned is, in my opinion, so large as to inevitably damage the whole infrastructure of the area.

Infrastructure: The proposed changes to the access to the A3, together with other recent and proposed road system changes will, in my opinion, have such a large negative impact on Burpham as to inevitably cause major traffic disruptions and should be entirely reconsidered.

The proposed development will generate a daily movement of thousands of vehicles the vast majority of which will pass through Burpham. This Plan represents yet another ill-conceived planning proposal, with insufficient thought given to the infrastructure needed.

The last few decades have seen two major housing estates, a considerable number of smaller garden grabbing developments, one super store and, recently, one very inappropriately sited supermarket. Both because of the volume and reduced speed of traffic, these changes regularly lead to severe air pollution which damages the quality of our lives in Burpham. The current Plan represents a major worsening in an already unacceptable traffic and pollution situation.

Traffic at the Burpham roundabout is regularly brought to a standstill with cars and delivery vehicles queuing to get into Aldi's inadequate car park. New Inn Lane and London Road are already subject to long traffic queues at all times of day. Extra traffic will inevitably cause even worse delays and pollution.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.
If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5892  Respondent: 8928289 / Trevor Skerritt  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the Doomsday Book.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hour. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.
There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for Infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is
stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

10. Any proposed link road to the A247 (as well as the massive proposed housing development itself) will have a significant detrimental impact on the rural outlook from the edge of West Clandon village (in particular the rural footpath leading from the junction of The Street and Lime Grove up to Highcotts Lane)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7673  Respondent: 8928961 / Sue Reeve  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Gosden Hill Farm

I strongly object to any development on this Green Belt site. Traffic generated by the housing and the associated park and ride facility could not be coped with.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/284  Respondent: 8929921 / Caspar Hancock  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

12) I OBJECT to the inclusion in the Plan of the site at Gosden Hill, which will cause chaos on many local roads as there are insufficient proposed infrastructure improvements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2144  Respondent: 8930209 / Ray Corstin  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
1. POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 – 2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcots Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.
No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham's sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: pslp172/2454  Respondent: 8930209 / Ray Corstin  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A25 Gosden Hill Farm, in that even though housing numbers at this site on the surface seem to have been revised slightly downward to 1700 from 2000, in actual fact the wording in Policy A25 now states 'Approximately 2,000 homes of which a minimum of 1,700 homes will be delivered within the plan period'. This seems to be attempting to indicate a change which in reality may not exist, and is misleading.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4488  Respondent: 8930465 / Michael & Carol Cook  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6128  Respondent: 8931233 / John Pemberton  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Site A25 Gosden Hill Farm 2200 houses. A massive over development in the Green belt and the traffic implications for Burpham are horrendous.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2421  Respondent: 8933537 / Annie Ladd  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital  Send Marsh Road
Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.
Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4536  Respondent: 8939425 / Petria Hiam  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7730  Respondent: 8940225 / Glen Ruddy  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.
1. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham's sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England's requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an "aspiration" in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime, given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.
Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
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10.1 As stated above, MGH fully supports the allocation of Gosden Hill as a strategic allocation site in the Local Plan. MGH confirms its commitment to the delivery of a residential led, mixed-use development which will make a significant contribution to meet the housing and infrastructure needs of the area.

10.2 MGH confirms that the site is deliverable, being within its ownership and available for development. MGH fully intends to bring forward the site at an early stage, through the preparation and submission of a planning application once the Local Plan has been submitted to the Secretary of State and is advancing towards adoption. It is anticipated that the site will make a contribution to housing delivery in the first five years of the Local Plan once adopted.

10.3 We set out below our specific comments in response to the criteria in Policy A25:

**Allocation**

**Capacity**

10.4 As MGH has indicated previously in representations submitted at the earlier stages of the Local Plan’s preparation, Gosden Hill has capacity for up to 2,000 homes. This is considered to be the maximum quantum of residential development which is deliverable taking into account, inter alia, the analysis of the site presented in the accompanying DFD; the requirements for on-site infrastructure; and the need to satisfy other policies in the Local Plan including those relating to Design.

10.5 We therefore consider it appropriate for the 1st bullet to be modified to refer to; “Up to 2000 homes”

**Education**

10.6 MGH agrees to the provision of a two forms of entry primary school to meet the needs arising from the development of Gosden Hill. This was incorporated into the Framework Masterplan included in the 2014 VDFD (Appendix 1) and is maintained in the Revised Framework Masterplan (Appendix 2) accompanying these representations.

10.7 The requirement for a secondary school to be provided on site has been introduced in this iteration of the Local Plan, following discussions with GBC and Surrey County Council (SCC) in early 2016.

10.8 A four forms of entry secondary school has been incorporated into the illustrative scheme as shown in the Revised Framework Masterplan (Appendix 2). The school could be situated in the north-eastern part of the site, where it would be within a short walk of the proposed Park and Ride (as required by the Infrastructure Schedule at Appendix C of the Local Plan – see SED1) and with good access to the proposed off-site sports pitches immediately to the east of the allocation.
10.9 MGH will continue to engage with SCC and GBC to review the requirement for the on-site provision of a secondary school, however, it should be made clear that any such requirement is for up to four forms of entry. We understand that the flexibility for this to be increased to up to six forms of entry is unnecessary, as such a need would not arise from the Local Plan, and therefore such references should be deleted.

10.10 We therefore seek an amendment to the 9th bullet to be modified to read; “A secondary school (D1) (four form entry, potentially as a through school; of which two forms are need for the housing on the site and the remainder for the wider area”).

Park and Ride

10.11 MGH is committed to providing the land and works/appropriate financial contributions to help deliver the physical infrastructure of the Park and Ride at Gosden Hill.

10.12 The successful operation of the Park and Ride will be dependent on GBC policies relating to the operation of existing Park and Ride sites and parking strategies within Guildford town centre. As such, it should be for GBC/SCC to operate the service and to ensure it will operate without public subsidy.

10.13 We therefore seek an amendment to the 10th bullet (or the 13th bullet, if the 10th is deleted due to duplication) to read; “Phased delivery of a park and ride facility, initially providing some 500 car parking spaces, with additional land reserved for potential expansion of the facility to up to 1,000 spaces.”

Requirements: Infrastructure

New Southbound Junction with the A3

10.14 We support the requirement for connections to the southbound carriageway only, as an appropriate junction to serve the development of Gosden Hill. The new A3 southbound slips which are to be provided by MGH in developing Gosden Hill are included within the strategic modelling undertaken by SCC (GBC Proposed Submission Local Plan ‘June 2016’ Strategic Highway Assessment Report).

10.15 It is evident from the strategic modelling which supports the Local Plan, that the infrastructure associated with the development of Gosden Hill will meet the needs of the development, whilst providing a strategic benefit to the operation of both the local and strategic highway (see paragraph 4.7.6 of the Strategic Highway Assessment Report).

10.16 Taking this into account, we seek the following amendment to bullet 11 of Policy A25; “A new junction on to the A3 southbound carriageway to meet the needs of the development, which could also provide strategic benefits to the A3 and local routes, comprising the relocated A3 southbound off-slip, a new A3 southbound on-slip and connection to the local road network via a new roundabout to the A3100, with associated infrastructure on the A3100 corridor within Burpham.”

Safeguarding for Aspirational All Movements Junction

10.17 The Strategic Highway Assessment Report prepared by SCC concludes that that the quantum and distribution of development proposed in the Local Plan together with the key highway schemes (Scenario 5), will not lead to severe impacts on the local and strategic highway network.

10.18 The modelling does not therefore identify the need for either a dedicated all moves junction to the east of Gosden Hill, or a tunnel under Guildford. Nor has the assessment tested a vehicular link between Gosden Hill and an all moves junction, or improved slips at Burntcommon and Send linked by a road with the B2215 London Road.

10.19 On the basis of SCC’s modelling, it is evident that a new southbound junction on the A3 will meet the needs of the development along with providing benefits to the wider network and that the delivery of an all moves junction or tunnel is not necessary to support the delivery of Gosden Hill. As such, any safeguarding is merely to meet an aspiration of GBC which is not soundly founded on robust evidence.
10.20 Clarity is required as to what is proposed; what is justified; and what is technically achievable in respect to providing an all moves junction between the A3100 London Road, the B2215 London Road and the A247 Clandon Road.

10.21 In our view, the 12th bullet should be removed entirely from Policy A25, as this is linked to an aspirational scheme which does not form part of the Local Plan, and particularly as no land has been identified or safeguarded between the eastern boundary of the Gosden Hill site and proposed slips at Burntcommon and Send. Alternatively, the wording should be amended as follows:

“A strip of land on the northern boundary of the site immediately adjacent to the A3 and to the east of the new junction should be safeguarded if, by the time of submitting a planning application for the development of Gosden Hill, Highways England has confirmed in writing that the delivery of a link eastwards to a currently aspirational scheme to provide strategic access to the A3 will form part of the Department for Transport’s “Road Investment Strategy”.

10.22 Whilst not a specific requirement of the Gosden Hill development, this safeguarded strip, if required, would likely preclude built development up to 30m from the edge of the current A3 carriageway and would facilitate the delivery of a link eastwards to such a wider scheme.”

Sustainable Movement Corridor

10.23 The delivery of sustainable movement corridors (SMC) across Guildford is supported by MGH.

10.24 The development of Gosden Hill will be brought forward with two new transport hubs in the form of a Guildford East (Merrow) Rail Station and a Park and Ride, with high quality connections within the site, between the two hubs and onwards towards Guildford. These will aid modal transfer for the benefit of the town and the development.

10.25 Given that the proposed sustainable movement corridor to the east of Guildford will increase accessibility to existing neighbourhoods of Boxhill, Merrow and Burpham, the wording of the 14th bullet should be amended to ensure clarity as to which sections of the SMC are to be provided by Gosden Hill and which sections will be delivered by GBC / SCC to facilitate modal change.

Guildford East Rail Station

10.26 The Guildford East (Merrow) railway station was identified in the SCC Rail Strategy (September 2013) and is a long held aspiration of both SCC and GBC. The principle of the proposal is also supported by Network Rail, Train Operating Companies and the Department for Transport.

10.27 A Guildford East (Merrow) station which could provide up to four trains per hour into Guildford and London would serve existing residents of Merrow and Burpham, businesses located at the Merrow Business Park and Merrow Depot and the new residents of Gosden Hill.

10.28 MGH will continue to engage with the Department for Transport, Network Rail, the Train Operating Companies, SCC and GBC to help ensure that the Guildford East (Merrow) station is deliverable and will operate at an appropriate stage in bringing forward the development of the site.

Traveller Pitches

10.29 Traveller pitches have been incorporated as part of the Revised Framework Masterplan provided at Appendix 2. This reflects GBC’s requirements, with the pitches situated in an area which reasonably integrated within the development with good connections to the facilities to be delivered at Gosden Hill.

Urban to Greenfield Transition

10.30 The 31st bullet in Policy A25 requires “sensitive design at site boundaries that has significant regard to the transition from urban to greenfield”. Whilst MGH does not disagree with the general principle, it is unnecessary in our view for this to be stated in policy, adding to the long list of criteria set out in Policy A25.
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These representations are submitted in support of land at Gosden Hill, North East Guildford which is allocated in the Local Plan (Policy A25) for the development of approximately 2,000 homes, employment, supporting facilities and services, and the supporting the delivery of strategic transport infrastructure.

The Site is in the sole freehold ownership of MGH and is immediately available for development. The enclosed representations wholly support the inclusion of the Site as a strategic allocation at North East Guildford and respond to individual draft policies contained within the Local Plan.

In support of these representations, a Vision and Development Framework Document (VDFD) originally submitted in 2014 is enclosed together with a Revised Framework Masterplan prepared in response to the updated policy requirements for the site, as set out in Policy A25 of the Local Plan.

On behalf of Martin Grant Homes, we have previously submitted representations to the earlier stages of the Local Plan's preparation including the regulation 19 Proposed Submission published in June 2016. We have not repeated our previously submitted representations relating to that stage of consultation.

These representations therefore relate only to the modifications to the Local Plan which form the basis of the consultation at this current stage.

'Our Vision and Ambition'

As we set out in more detail below, we have concerns regarding the proposed reduction in housing requirement associated with the reduced objectively assessed housing need (OAHN) in the West Surrey Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) Guildford Addendum Report (2017).

We also note that the Inspector appointed to examine the Waverley Borough Local Plan has advised that Council that it will need to consider accommodating up to 50% of the unmet housing need arising from Woking Borough (approximately 113 dpa). It is understood that Guildford Borough Council will potentially need to increase its housing requirement in response to this issue through its Local Plan.
Similarly, we have concerns regarding the reduction in the quantum of new employment land proposed to be allocated through the Local Plan.

However, we recognise that the Local Plan proposes, in particular, to significantly boost the supply of housing, well above existing levels of delivery. In this regard, we support the proposed release of land from the Green Belt including Gosden Hill to help deliver the identified OAHN for the Borough.

We note that the final paragraph of the Local Plan's 'Vision and Ambition' has not been modified, signalling that little or no progress has been made by the Council since June 2016 regarding the Department for Transport's (DfT) Road Investment Strategy (RIS) relating to major improvement to the A3 through Guildford. We strongly urge the Council, working with Highways England and the DfT, to resolve this potential infrastructure capacity issue.

**Policy S2: Planning for the Borough - Our Spatial Development Strategy**

Our client is strongly supportive of the Council progressing its Local Plan and seeking to secure its adoption as soon as practicably possible, including its submission by early 2018. However, we are concerned that the reduced level of housing proposed and the associated evidence base is very likely to attract objections.

Barton Willmore has not undertaken a technical review of the SHMA Addendum, however, there is a strong likelihood in our view that the reduction in OAN/housing requirement will be criticised. In particular, there is a risk that a partial update of the SHMA which relates to Guildford Borough, as opposed to the entire HMA, will be questioned. We recommend that the Council should undertake a further review of the SHMA, jointly with Waverley and Woking Boroughs, taking account of the new standardised methodology for calculating OAHN. This work should be completed prior to the Examination of the Local Plan in 2018.

In addition, we raise concerns regarding the phased trajectory which is proposed in Policy S2. The Council's approach 'back-loads' housing delivery towards the end of the plan period. The much lower level of housing proposed within the first 5 years from the expected date of adoption is potentially inconsistent with national policy and the Government's target of one million additional homes being delivered by 2020. We note, however, that the Local Plan proposes to release land from the Green Belt including strategic sites in order to meet the identified OAHN. In our view, the Council has taken a reasonable approach to the rate of delivery of the proposed allocations.

We note that the 'Annual Housing Target' table in Policy 52 provides annual figures from 2019/20 up to 2033/34. These total 9,810 dwellings, and therefore it is understood that this assumes 2,616 dwellings will be delivered during 2015-2019 (four years), at an annual rate of 654dpa. However, we note that 388 dwellings were completed in 2015/16, leaving 2,228 dwellings to be delivered in the subsequent three years (2016 - 2019), equivalent to a rate of 743dpa. It is unclear from the Council's evidence whether this is achievable.

Any under-delivery of housing in the early part of the plan period, prior to the Local Plan's adoption, could potentially compound other concerns regarding the deliverability of the Council's housing strategy. We urge the Council to consider whether its approach to housing provision as set out in Policy S2 is soundly based.

**Policy H1: Homes for All**

We note that the Council has modified the policy requirements associated with the provision of Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople pitches and plots. However, the allocation of plots to proposed allocations for new residential development is unchanged. On behalf of our client, we object to the approach which includes the allocation of pitches or plots to the Gosden Hill strategic allocation in Policy A25. We comment on this issue in more detail below in response to Policy A25.

**Policy 1D1: Infrastructure and Delivery**

In our view, it is inappropriate to include criterion (3) in Policy 1D1 when criteria (1), (2) and (5) set out a reasonably clear policy framework to secure the timely provision of infrastructure necessary to support new development.

We therefore recommend the deletion of criterion (3).
Policy A25: Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow Lane, Guildford

Martin Grant Homes continues to support the proposed allocation of Gosden Hill through the Local Plan. Similarly, we support the Council progressing the Local Plan and seeking to secure its adoption as soon as practicably possible.

We welcome the modifications to Policy A25 which, in part, appear to have responded to the representations which we submitted on behalf of our client in response to the 2016 Local Plan.

We comment as follows in respect of Policy A25 as modified.

Allocation

Criterion (1) - Residential Capacity and Delivery

We support the Council's cautious approach to the delivery of the site (and other strategic sites) within the plan period. This will assist in ensuring that the delivery of housing through allocated sites meets the Local Plan's requirement.

Criterion (2) - Gypsy and Traveller Pitches

On behalf of our client, we object to the requirement for Gypsy and Traveller pitches to be delivered as part of the development.

Criterion (9) - Secondary School Provision

We welcome the modifications clarifying the requirement for secondary school provision. However, as stated below, we consider that the requirement for a four form entry secondary school should be stated as a maximum. It would also be appropriate in our view for the policy to state that "approximately" two forms are needed to meet the needs of the development.

We therefore propose the following modification to this criterion:

A secondary school (01) (up to four form entry, of which approximately two forms are needed for the housing on the site, and the remainder for the wider area).

Requirements

Criterion (1) - Improved Junction on the A3

We welcome the clarification proposed under criterion (1) of the 'Requirements - Infrastructure' section of Policy A25. Martin Grant Homes continues to support the proposed access with the A3 which will serve the development of Gosden Hill and also provide benefits to the wider network.

Criterion (2) - Potential Opportunity to Provide an All Movements Junction

On the basis of Surrey County Council's (SCC's) modelling, it is evident that an improved southbound junction on the A3 (as proposed in criterion (1) under 'Requirements - Infrastructure' in Policy A25) will meet the needs of the development of Gosden Hill. It will also provide benefits to the wider network.

The Strategic Highway Assessment Report prepared by SCC concludes that that the quantum and distribution of development proposed in the Local Plan, together with the key highway schemes, will not lead to severe impacts on the local and strategic highway network. The modelling does not therefore identify the need for a dedicated all-moves junction at Gosden Hill and nor has the assessment tested a vehicular link between the A3100, Gosden Hill and a stretched all moves junction at the B2215 London Road / A247 Clandon Road.

The delivery of a new northbound on-slip to the A3 trunk road from A247 Clandon Road and a new southbound off-slip from the A3 trunk road to A247 Clandon Road, in addition to the existing northbound off-slip at Burnt Common (B2215 London Road) and the existing on-slip at the A247 Clandon Road I Ripley By-Pass could potentially create a stretched 'all-moves' junction to the northeast of Guildford. Importantly, however, the delivery of an all-moves junction is not
necessary to support the delivery of Gosden Hill. As such, the delivery of a connector road to the B2215 London Road I A247 Clandon Road is merely to meet an aspiration of GBC which is not supported by any robust evidence base.

On this basis, criterion (2) under 'Requirements- Infrastructure' should be deleted. Alternatively, this is moved to be listed under the 'Opportunities' section of Policy A25, to make clear that this aspirational scheme is not a requirement of the development of Gosden Hill.

**Criterion (3) -Park and Ride**

Martin Grant Homes is committed to providing the land and works/appropriate financial contributions to help deliver the physical infrastructure of the Park and Ride at Gosden Hill.

The successful operation of the Park and Ride will be dependent on the Council's policies relating to the operation of existing Park and Ride sites and parking strategies within Guildford town centre. As such, it should be for the Council and sec to operate the service and to ensure it will operate without public subsidy. Furthermore, it is not fair or reasonable for the developer to be expected to subsidise a Park and Ride service in perpetuity.

We therefore seek an amendment to criterion (3) under 'Infrastructure', to read;

**Land and Park and Ride facility, of a sufficient scale as required by projected demand at the time of the submission of an application.**

**Criterion (4) -Sustainable Movement Corridor**

The delivery of Sustainable Movement Corridors across Guildford is supported by Martin Grant Homes.

Martin Grant Homes and its consultant team will continue to engage positively with the Council and sec to investigate the improvements along the eastern route section, as envisaged in the Sustainable Movement Corridor Supplementary Planning Document, to be funded by the development of Gosden Hill, necessary to mitigate its impact.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
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**Criterion (5) -Bus Network**

The delivery of housing at Gosden Hill provides an opportunity for existing bus routes to be strengthened and for new routing opportunities and modern public transport opportunities to be realised. It is likely that commercial operators will wish to serve the new residential dwellings and the proposed Guildford East (Merrow) Rail Station.

However, either clarity should be provided on what constitutes a "significant bus network" or the wording should be amended to read:

**Provide access to the public transport network, including the potential opportunities to serve the site via local and demand responsive bus services linking the site with key destinations including the existing suburbs of Guildford and the town centre.**
**Criterion (7) - Guildford East Rail Station**

The Guildford East (Merrow) station which could provide up to four trains per hour into Guildford and London would serve existing residents of Merrow and Burpham, businesses located at the Merrow Business Park and Merrow Depot and the new residents of Gosden Hill.

The principle of the proposal is supported by Network Rail, Train Operating Companies and the Department for Transport (DfT). FirstGroup MTR South Western Trains, which was recently awarded the South Western franchise for a period of seven years from August 2017, has publicly committed to work with stakeholders to progress the plans for new station at Guildford East (Merrow).

Martin Grant Homes is continuing to engage with the DfT, Network Rail, the train operating companies, sec and the Council to identify the necessary land and reasonable financial contributions to support the delivery of the Guildford East (Merrow) station.

**Criterion (11) - Secondary Educational Need**

On behalf of our client, we will continue to work with sec Education and the Council to agree any new secondary school provision as part of the development of Gosden Hill. We understand that the wording now set out in Policy A25 reflects SCC’s latest advice. However, it would be appropriate for the wording of this criterion to reflect the likelihood that secondary educational need will potentially need to be reviewed through pre-application discussions and through the determination of a planning application. Indeed, sec may also wish to allow the flexibility as part of a future planning permission to secure all (up to four forms of entry) or part of the secondary school provision on the site.

We therefore propose the following modified wording to this criterion:

*Secondary educational need will be re-assessed at the time a planning application is being prepared, during determination and prior to construction, at which time any recent new secondary school provision will be taken into account. The associated off site playing fields must be dual use and secured through the planning application process.*

**Opportunities**

The final section of Policy A25 - under the header of 'Opportunities' - has been added at this stage of the Local Plan process. It is unclear whether the criteria set out in this section are regarded as 'desirable' or 'essential'. Criteria (1) and (2) appear to be requirements rather than opportunities. Similarly, criterion (4) appears to be a requirement. All three of these criteria appear to be duplicating with other policies in the Local Plan and therefore appear to be unnecessary.

Criterion (3) begins with the word "potential", suggesting that this is a desirable component of the future development of the site.

In our view, this section of Policy A25 is ambiguous and its status in future decision making unclear. Notwithstanding this general concern,

**Criterion (3) - Potential through Route within the Site**

Martin Grant Homes support criterion (3) under 'Opportunities', setting out the potential to provide a link through the site between the 82234 and the improved A3 access. This has the potential to provide greater permeability through the site and also the opportunity to divert traffic from the 82234 and A3100. This would provide access to the Railway Station, the Park and Ride, Primary and Secondary schooling and could potentially bring about wider strategic infrastructure improvements, assisting in the delivery of the Local Plan.

However, the form of any such access road and link between the 82234 and A3 improved access requires careful consideration as it will ultimately increase vehicular movements through the site and will cause some localised redistribution.

While the inclusion of this opportunity is welcomed, the text should be amended to read:
Potential to provide an access into the site from the south, which could facilitate the diversion of the 82234 through the site to the improved A3 access, providing a more direct link than the 82234 I A3100 for all modes. Any such link should be subject to further assessment prior to any application on the site.

Criterion (4) - Bus, Cycle and Pedestrian Links

Martin Grant Homes is committed to developing a sustainable urban extension including contributing toward the Sustainable Movement Corridor which will provide a high-quality connection for pedestrians, cyclists and buses between the proposed Park and Ride and Guildford East (Merrow) Railway Station, through the site and onwards towards Guildford. These infrastructure improvements will aid modal transfer for both existing and future residents of the town and the development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
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I OBJECT to green field development in general and in particular to the inclusion of all Green Belt sites. Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated for the proposed development of Green Belt land.

I OBJECT to the identification of sites without regard to local housing requirements – the volume of housing allocated to rural areas bears no relation whatsoever to the actual housing requirements of those areas. The local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

I OBJECT to the identification of sites without regard to the impact on infrastructure.

All Green Belt sites should be removed from the plan until exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/4998  | **Respondent:** 8954977 / Patrick Sheard  | **Agent:** |  
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25 |

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I also object to the proposed development of 2000 homes at Gosden Hill Farm. Whilst I would concede that this site could accommodate a (much) lower number of homes, the surrounding road infrastructure is totally inadequate to accommodate the number of homes proposed and would result in an urban sprawl spreading form Guildford through Burpham to Send Parish and West Clandon.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/5247  | **Respondent:** 8961889 / F Turner  | **Agent:** |  
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25 |

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**
I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.
The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ). is Sound? ( ). is Legally Compliant? ( )

CPRE OBJECTION TO POLICY A25 : Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow Lane,Guildford

CPRE has many reasons for considering this proposal unsound which are listed below :

1. The land which is proposed for development is all open Green Belt countryside of an attractive character which it is now suggested should be surrendered to urban The NPPF states "the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openess and their permanence".Boundary changes to the Green Belt can only be made at the time of a Local Plan consultation in "exceptional circumstances".The draft Local Plan does not provide sufficient detailed evidence of the strategic development proposed to meet this requirement. The Green Belt between Burpham and West Clandon forms part of the green approach to Guildford and provides a clearly defined boundary to the urban area. Much of the building proposed falls within the Parish of West Clandon but the principal impact of the traffic from the new site will be experienced in Burpham which already suffers badly from congestion and air pollution.It is felt that a better solution to these problems is required.

1. The proposal cannot be considered seriously until Highways England have decided how the A3 infrastructure can best be handled in this No decision is likely to be made by them until at the earliest 2020.Their policy requires that 4 way junctions have to be set at a specified distance apart which at the moment seems to rule out the use of land adjoining Potters Lane.

1. It is equally important that a decision is made about a possible tunnel for Guildford asit will be necessary to decide where provision for access should be made in the vicinity of Burpham.It is not known exactly what route the tunnel will follow but Compton has been mentioned as its possible other entrance.As far as we know,there are only estimates available as to its likely cost and the time that it would take to build.If a tunnel were to be used to link Burpham and Compton,substantial additional road infrastructure would be needed for the 83000 both at Puttenham and Compton.

1. Planning as to whether a railway station at Merrow will be bui t seems to be uncertain and depends on decisions involving Network Rail. We are informed there is no reference to a railway station at Merrow in the Wessex Plan for future railway deel The station can only therefore be considered in an aspirational category as so few details are available as to its design,exact location,operation,car and bus access and parking provision. Space currently occupied by the Surrey depot in Merrow will we understand be used on one side of the track but there is no information as to the rest of the station layout including a bridge over the lines. Road access for the station will probably require the replacement of the railway bridge over Merrow Lane near its junction with New Inn lane (B2234) where lights control the traffic.

1. Before 2000 houses could be bui t at the site proposed,water supply, the sewage network,and other infrastructure issues would need to be resol We are informed that the electricity pylons near the A3 would also need to be changed owing to a capacity requirement.

2. There has been a history of linear development along the A3 in Burpham,The latest example Wey Lea was promised a range of community facilities which we believe never materiali Burpham residents do not want this experience to be repeated for the proposed new settlement and are doubtful from past experience that undertakings in this context will be honoured.

1. Plans for a Slyfield Link Road also now appear largely aspirational.There is little confidence either in Burpham at present about the value of plans for a "sustainable movement corridor".It appears that London Road will fonn part of the SMC with two way traffic in single lanes plus an additional lane in each direction for buses and cycles.It is felt that this will add to an already difficult traffic situation.

1. The Burpham Community Association issued the following statement at a well attended public meeting on 11th July 2016 regarding development of Gosden Hill Farm and its " huge impact" on Burpham : "Two thousand homes, offices and industrial sites, a Park and Ride for up to 1,000 cars, two schools and the possibility of a new station at Merrow will put thousands more vehicles on to already very congested roads.Access to the proposed development is by a new A3 southbound off/on slip road and the present slip road to Burpham and Merrow will become two way. This means that all traffic from Gosden Hill wishing to use the northbound A3 will have to
drive through Burpham to the Clay Lane slip. The BCA goes on to say that "the only sensible solution is a four way intersection around Potters Lane as proposed in the 1980s, which would give north and south bound access to the A3. If it is decided that a tunnel is the only answer to Guildford's traffic congestion, then it is short-sighted to dump homes and all the associated infrastructure on the most suitable land for a tunnel entrance."

1. The other A3 entrance to the possible tunnel may need to be located at Compton which also suffers heavily from road traffic congestion and air pollution on the CPRE does not pretend to have the necessary engineering knowledge as to the practicability of such a solution nor of the possible cost and time needed for its implementation. We do, however, know something about the successful introduction of the Hindhead tunnel in Waverley, and we recall that it was clearly indicated when the decision was taken to go ahead there, that the former traffic congestion at Hindhead would reappear at Guildford a few miles down the A3 once the tunnel was built. This has duly occurred. It would seem logical that if an A3 tunnel is considered desirable at Hindhead to keep the traffic flowing and also protect the countryside, then surely it should at least be considered as a possible solution now at Guildford to reduce congestion and improve the urban environment and quality of life of those living in and visiting the county town.

1. The evidence on future traffic conditions which is produced in the Strategic Highway Assessment Report (SHAR) has been produced late and is unfinished. This vital input has not been available in time for it to inform the draft Local Plan or the subsequent consultation. CPRE considers that this whole proposal is not ready for enclosure in the draft Local Plan and is therefore unsound.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
For some time now we have seen new houses appearing wherever space has become available and we have had to absorb this, but your Gosden Hill proposal would be catastrophic.

The A3100 through Burpham is already overworked: Most of it is single lane each way and there is little scope to widen it. Your enormous Gosden Hill Farm proposal is likely to increase the number of cars using the A3100 to such an extent that residents living alongside or in the side roads will find themselves trapped.

The A3 has caused dissatisfaction ever since I came to Guildford 21 years ago and it needs priority consideration.

I am not a surveyor, nor do I have the technical knowledge to make worthwhile feasible suggestions, but the Burpham Community Association has done extensive research into the problems and has some professional expertise. I must ask you to consider their response very carefully.

Why do we need such a ridiculous number of houses and who says that we need them? Can the utilities ie sewers, water supplies, gas and electricity meet the demands?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Ripley through to Guildford.

The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6448  Respondent: 9080065 / Shan Gregory-Smith  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to register my support for the Guildford Residents Association (GRA) response and oppose Guildford expanding by a quarter.

Living in Burpham, I have real concern for the impact of further traffic congestion with the development on Gosden Hill.

Central Guildford is already often congested and a "bottle neck" during peak times. Solutions for transport issues remain unresolved.

Guildford is a gap town and expansion should be constrained to protect its character and the green belt as much as possible.

Other towns in this area are seeking to constrain their overall housing growth and I feel Guildford should be similarly cautious.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3208  Respondent: 9094753 / D Jones  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.
The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burnt Common and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital  Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.
No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5271</th>
<th>Respondent: 9335041 / David Reeve</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I OBJECT** on the grounds that the scale of development in the borough is unsubstantiated (see sections 1.1 and 1.2 above).

**I OBJECT** on the grounds that (in conjunction with other sites) this proposal would lead to – or certainly facilitate – an almost continuous ribbon of development along the A3.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/148</th>
<th>Respondent: 9557825 / Richard Powell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site A25 / Gosden Hill**

1. I object to this proposal. I am again concerned about the scale of this development and the pressure it would put on local services (education & health). I also question the impact this number of additional people will place on A3 congestion (North & Southbound).

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2920</th>
<th>Respondent: 9607905 / Anne Pascoe</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Claridon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.
Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary everyday during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Crandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually everyday and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked everyday.

Burpham's sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England's requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an "inspiration" in the local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT TO site A25 Gosden Hill Farm – massive overdevelopment of 2000 homes in the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/7896</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>10448129 / Owen Jones</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REPRESENTATIONS ON BEHALF OF BLOOR HOMES LTD AND MMES MELVILLE-RAE, CHICK, KELLOCK AND MCDavid.

Introduction

Bloor Homes Ltd are working with Mmes Melville-Rae, Chick, Kellock and McDavid, to promote land at Gosden Hill Farm for future development.

Part of the land concerned is identified within the strategic allocation at Gosden Hill Farm which is the subject of Policy A25. The principle of this strategic allocation is supported.

In addition, a larger area of land immediately to the east of the allocated site, at Nutbourne Fruit Farm, is also promoted for inclusion as part of the strategic allocation. This parcel of land comprises a single building and an area of land used for car boot sales with its own access from the A3.

Scope of Representations

In these representations we comment on the following matters:

- The spatial strategy, the distribution of new housing and Green Belt;
- The scale of new housing proposed and the objectively assessed need; and
- The Gosden Hill strategic site

Together, the representations demonstrate why the Local Plan cannot presently be considered to be sound but that the allocation of this additional parcel of land will address this.

Gosden Hill Farm Strategic Allocation

We support, as a matter of principle, the identification of the strategic allocation at Gosden Hill Farm. Development adjacent to the main urban area affords sustainability and accessibility advantages and comprises a logical extension to the pattern of growth in Guildford contained by transport infrastructure. The mixed use nature of the proposed development envisaged by Policy A25 will lead to a juxtaposition of land uses that contribute to an intrinsically sustainable new community. Added to which, the transportation measures identified will strengthen accessibility to, and the vitality of, the town centre. Moreover, the Green Belt Study has identified the location (land parcels C1 and C2) as being of Medium Sensitivity; very few locations around Guildford have this status.

Within the Green Belt Study the land concerned is located within parcel C3. It is of note that within the Green Belt Purposes Assessment Schedule (page 28) the only Green Belt function that land within C3 serves is preventing neighbouring settlements from merging. It is this less significant than within C2 which perform two Green Belt functions.
The land concerned is partly located within the strategic allocation; that being the land north east of Nuthill Farm. The remainder of the land is situated immediately to the east of the current boundary of the allocation. The land concerned is situated immediately south of the A3 (Ripley By-pass) and west of the A247. Overall, it measures approximately 19 hectares in size.

We are seeking the inclusion of this additional parcel of land for the following reasons:

The land use requirements of Policy A25 are considerable, as is necessary with a mixed use development of this scale. The land-take implications of these uses, the associated physical infrastructure requirements and the need to protect existing green infrastructure are similarly considerable. We note that the residential dwelling capacity of Areas C1 and C2 within the Green Belt Study identify on some 1600 new dwellings, somewhat below that required by the allocation. The additional land available at Nutbourne Fruit Farm will add surety that the strategic allocation can be delivered, thus its inclusion within the identified area will add flexibility to the plan.

The housing land supply strategy set out in Table 1 (when added to completions actual and estimated between 2013 and 2018) does not provide the necessary flexibility to give surety that the overall strategic housing requirement of 13,800 additional dwellings over the plan period will be met. With total supply estimated at on 14,400 additional dwellings, this represents less than 5%. This is not considered to be adequate in the circumstances of this plan and the nature of the housing supply strategy. Enlarging the Gosden Hill Farm allocation will further strengthen housing supply in a manner entirely consistent with the strategy.

None of this land is situated within the area of high sensitivity as regards Green Belt function and in this regard is indistinguishable from the allocation as a whole. Optimising development at Guildford through the inclusion of this land is beneficial to the release of less sustainable Green Belt land in villages and or less accessible non Green Belt land. Development of the parcels concerned will not lead to coalescence with West Clandon.

This amendment will be consistent with national planning policy, strengthening this flexibility and deliverability of one on the plan’s major housing allocations. The amendment sought is shown on the attached plan.

Without prejudice to the support given to Policy A25 and the proposed enlargement sought through these representations, we comment below on the infrastructure requirements identified for the proposed development.

The second bullet point refers to development proposal needing to have regard to the potential opportunity to provide an all movements junction of the A3 trunk road with the A3100 London Road, the B2215 London Road, and the A247 Clarendon Road.

At best this is an aspiration and is referred to in such terms in the June 2016 Transport Strategy. Put simply, the business case to secure such funding has not been made out and there are significant planning and statutory approvals that are necessary. To the best of our knowledge there are no plans to exhibit what is in fact referred to. The indicative programme within the Transport Strategy does not include reference to SRN11. Similarly, the associated Transport Topic Paper does not refer to SRN11. Neither is it referred to in draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

On this basis, the masterplanning exercise will need to adopt a realistic approach to the likely delivery of this so as not to preclude development opportunities unnecessary. The representors would welcome the opportunity of participating in the masterplanning exercise with Martin Grant Homes.

Summary

The representors own land that is identified within the Gosden Hill Farm strategic allocation which is the subject of Policy 25. They support the principle of this strategic allocation.

In addition, however, they seek the enlargement of this site to include an additional land parcel immediately north east of the current boundary of the allocation. The land concerned is no different in Green Belt categorisation to that of the land allocated. It is presently occupied by a single building and is used for car boot sales. Development would therefore represent a more effective use of the land concerned.
Enlarging the allocation in the manner proposed would provide additional development opportunities to ensure the housing requirements of the Plan are met.

This amendment will address the potential finding of unsoundness on the basis that the strategy is not fully compliant with national planning policy and will add greater flexibility.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: 160717 Gosden Hill Farm - Bloor et al.pdf (326 KB)

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4442  Respondent: 10551937 / Anne Davies  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/491  Respondent: 10569473 / Laura Gold  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Supportive of public tenure pitches as it is easier and provides a level of control.

Support that GBC allocate and manage the pitches as it ensures fairness and tenure security. Support inclusion of garden provision and softer landscaping.

Utility blocks are necessary as no one will want to live somewhere without a utility block and the site will end up being a transit site. No facilities of space within a mobile home for washing facilities. If a family could afford a unit with wash facilities, it is likely they would be on a private site anyway.

Strongly support the need for inclusion and breaking down of barriers, particularly for the children.

Agree with softer landscaping to resist isolation.

If outhouses or utility blocks are not including, outbuildings will be built anyway.

Support phasing of the sites.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/493  Respondent: 10569473 / Laura Gold  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Good to see more secondary schools, particularly of smaller sizes.

Support park and ride opportunities. Would like to see more community facilities in local areas as currently cannot do anything without a car.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/483  Respondent: 10569537 / Kelly King  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Good to see more secondary schools, particularly of smaller sizes.

Support park and ride opportunities. Would like to see more community facilities in local areas as currently cannot do anything without a car.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/486  Respondent: 10569537 / Kelly King  Agent:
### Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Supportive of public tenure pitches as it is easier and provides a level of control.

Support that GBC allocate and manage the pitches as it ensures fairness and tenure security. Support inclusion of garden provision and softer landscaping.

Utility blocks are necessary as no one will want to live somewhere without a utility block and the site will end up being a transit site No facilities of space within a mobile home for washing facilities. If a family could afford a unit with wash facilities, it is likely they would be on a private site anyway.

Strongly support the need for inclusion and breaking down of barriers, particularly for the children.

Agree with softer landscaping to resist isolation.

If outhouses or utility blocks are not including, outbuildings will be built anyway.

Support phasing of the sites.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

### Comment ID: pslp172/4403  **Respondent:** 10570977 / Laura Richards  **Agent:**

**Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25**

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6146</th>
<th>Respondent: 10619169 / Wendy Critchlow</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital  Send Marsh Road
Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.
Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2615  Respondent: 10619233 / Alex I. Donaldson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am a resident of Burpham and I write to express my very strong objection to Guildford Borough Council’s Draft Local Plan June 2016 for the development of Gosden Hill Farm. I have many objections to the development but chief among them are the following.

1. The development will be on the Green Belt and will result in the loss of a section of this valuable amenity forever.
2. The proposals for two thousand houses, offices and industrial sites, a Park and Ride, two schools and the possibility of a station will result in several thousand additional vehicles on already congested roads.
3. It is proposed that access to the A3 will be by a new A3 southbound off/on slip road and the present southbound slip road to Burpham and Merrow will become two way. Consequently, vehicles leaving Gosden Hill and intending to travel north on the A3 towards London will have to travel through Burpham to the Clay Lane slip road. This will impact on Burpham which regularly experiences periods of severe traffic congestion.
4. Guildford is already a bottle-neck on the A3 and the Gosden Hill Farm development will exacerbate this problem. The only practical solution is to build a tunnel with a four way intersection near Potters Land and another one near Compton.

I have lived in Burpham for 43 years. The area has “played it’s part” in contributing to the development of Guildford following previous local developments which include: Weylea Farm; Weybrook Farm; Merrow Park, Sainsbury’s and Aldi’s. I am greatly disheartened by the proposed and unnecessary development of Gosden Hill Farm which will have very negative consequences for the local environment (air and noise pollution) as well as adding to the amount of traffic in an already congested area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7499  Respondent: 10619233 / Alex I. Donaldson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I am a resident of Burpham and I write to express my very strong objection to Guildford Borough Council’s Draft Local Plan June 2016 for the development of Gosden Hill Farm. I have many objections to the development but chief among them are the following.

1. The development will be on the Green Belt and will result in the loss of a section of this valuable amenity forever.
2. The proposals for two thousand houses, offices and industrial sites, a Park and Ride, two schools and the possibility of a station will result in several thousand additional vehicles on already congested roads.
3. It is proposed that access to the A3 will be by a new A3 southbound of/on slip road and the present southbound slip road to Burpham and Merrow will become two way. Consequently, vehicles leaving Gosden Hill and intending to travel north on the A3 towards London will have to travel through Burpham to the Clay Lane slip road. This will impact on Burpham which regularly experiences periods of severe traffic congestion.
4. Guildford is already a bottle-neck on the A3 and the Gosden Hill Farm development will exacerbate this problem. The only practical solution is to build a tunnel with a four way intersection near Potters Land and another one near Compton.

I have lived in Burpham for 43 years. The area has “played it’s part” in contributing to the development of Guildford following previous local developments which include: Weylea Farm; Weybrook Farm; Merrow Park, Sainsbury’s and Aldi’s. I am greatly disheartened by the proposed and unnecessary development of Gosden Hill Farm which will have very negative consequences for the local environment (air and noise pollution) as well as adding to the amount of traffic in an already congested area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Any development at "Gosden Hill Farm" needs a 4 way interchange on the A3 road, close to Burpham's slip road, this is planned from 2021 but is out of kilter with an aspirational "Guildford Tunnel" which if done is likely to be in this area, will not be delivered until 2023 -2027; so there will be a period of intense traffic overload in Burpham.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4130  
Respondent: 10643457 / Burpham Neighbourhood Forum (Catherine Hughes)  
Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am a resident of Burpham for over 30 years and I wish to Object strongly to the Guildford Borough Council’s Draft Local Plan June 2016, as it is unsound.

Development on Gosden Hill Farm which is in Green Belt land has not been thought through. There is a clash of plans, to build a vast development, including, homes, schools, park + ride, train station etc. but no plan for its traffic control other than through Burpham village, and an aspirational plan for a tunnel under Guildford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7580  
Respondent: 10663585 / Nigel Killick  
Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object specifically to the proposed building on Gosden hill farm. This is green belt land and separates West Clandon Village from urban sprawl.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2154  
Respondent: 10667073 / Trudi Harris  
Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

14. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.
No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, 62215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools. Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day. Burpham's sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost. There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England's requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an "aspiration" in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3. Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4644  **Respondent:** 10667073 / Trudi Harris  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25
C.i. Policy 25 Gosden Hill – My Objections

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon – a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I object to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham's sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost. How is this going to be funded?

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. How is this going to be addressed?

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England's requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an "aspiration" in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.
Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4473  Respondent: 10672417 / Matthew Kalupka  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4584  Respondent: 10703745 / Frank Fuller  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.

4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.

5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon to be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43 at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/833  Respondent: 10717985 / Alison Drennan  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object. There simply is no evidence that the borough requires excessive development and GBC fail to identify the 'need' for this. Building on such a beautiful site will be utterly detrimental and irreversible. Such development would also cause significant impact on traffic - which has not been considered or allowed for in the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8069  Respondent: 10722049 / Richard Smith  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The strategic sites of Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill are in locations that simply cannot sustain the increase in traffic that will result from these developments. None of these sites is close to a mainline railway station and it is quite simply a fallacy to believe that the residents of these proposed settlements will walk or cycle to...
work. Any increase in the bus services will do no more than add to the existing traffic mayhem. New residents will have few options but to be reliant on motor vehicles. For these reasons, consideration must be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from severe congestion during extended rush hour periods and the Council has woefully failed to address the problem of through traffic from London and the South competing with local Guildford traffic on the A3 as it passes through the Town. The additional vehicle traffic that these proposals will generate will lead to ever worsening congestion, safety issues for pedestrians and increased danger for cyclists, particularly those from outside the Borough who now regularly cycle on the Olympic route for pleasure in ever increasing numbers. Residents, health and safety and the environment will all suffer as a result.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

1. I OBJECT to the Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan.

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost. How is this going to be funded?

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. How is this going to be addressed?
Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36% or 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of this development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/955  Respondent: 10726561 / L. Boyle  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have further objections to the large proposed development of 2,000 houses at Wisley Airfield, 2,000 houses at Gosden Hill Policy A25 and 1,850 houses at Blackwell Farm because it will destroy large areas of Green Belt and agricultural land and produce congestion on the A3 and surrounding roads including Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5864  Respondent: 10727457 / Colin Eke  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• I OBJECT to the proposed development of Gosden Hill Farm (Policy A25) and its inevitable impact on the roads around Send. Despite assurances of an additional railway station, commuters will utilise the opportunity to
leave the A3 at the existing Burnt Common roundabout and travel on the faster Woking to Waterloo line, rather than use the slower Guildford line.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5293</th>
<th>Respondent: 10727489 / Gaynor Eke</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- I OBJECT to the proposed development of Gosden Hill Farm (Policy A25) and its inevitable impact on the roads around Send. Despite assurances of an additional railway station, commuters will utilise the opportunity to leave the A3 at the existing Burnt Common roundabout and travel on the faster Woking to Waterloo line, rather than use the slower Guildford line.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3045</th>
<th>Respondent: 10729281 / Richard Croxford</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the proposed development at Gosden Hill Farm, on the basis that the proposal is too large, occupies Green Belt land and will add to infrastructure problems.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4162</th>
<th>Respondent: 10731265 / Liz Turner</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gosden Hill:

The scale of this proposal would have a major visual and use impact on the A3 and other local roads. It would affect the appearance of the borough as a predominantly rural area and clog up the A3.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5530</th>
<th>Respondent: 10731329 / Sheila Hookins</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3873</th>
<th>Respondent: 10732193 / Leslie Bowerman</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposal to build 2,000 houses at Gosden Hill for the same reasons as set out in the paragraph above relating to Wisley Airfield (apart from the effect on the RHS). I also object to the taking of another huge chunk of Green Belt to make Guildford into one vast conurbation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2293</th>
<th>Respondent: 10733089 / Chris Barber</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I object to the development of 2000 new houses at Gosden Hill Farm as that effectively could mean 4000 more cars using the congested A3 and surrounding road infrastructure, and if it does proceed must first have the new schools and new medical centre to support that development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6831</th>
<th>Respondent: 10735777 / S. May</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.
Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6278  Respondent: 10756033 / John Herbert  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object specifically to the proposed building on Gosden Hill on Green Belt designated to prevent West Clandon being absorbed into a sprawling urban environment four times the size of the village it blights.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2274  Respondent: 10758593 / Richard & Delia Baker  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.
The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham's sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England's requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an "aspiration" in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6012  **Respondent:** 10765249 / Andy & Sonja Freebody  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.
It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 June 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see above and below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.
The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained. To allow this would be plain irresponsible.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Gosden Hill development of 1700 houses. Reference to a potential link road from the development to the A247. The clear implication is for an access from the development to the A247 with enormous traffic implications for the A247.
South bound off- and on- slip roads to service the development and replace the existing off- slip road to Burpham. The only North bound access to the A3 will be via the existing slip road off Clay Lane. (See later, Burnt Common).

A 4-entry form secondary school, a primary school, a retail centre and a park and ride for up to 700 cars.

When developed, the new employment site at the north side of Gosden Hill Farm (site allocation A25) will be treated as an Office and Research & Development Strategic Employment Site (7000sq.m). This could mean several hundred employees.

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital  Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.
The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7687</th>
<th>Respondent: 10773153 / Miles Palmer</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td><strong>( )</strong></td>
<td><strong>( )</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td><strong>( )</strong></td>
<td><strong>( )</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td><strong>( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon,
gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

Again the infrastructure required does not seem to have been address in the plan.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants. The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4439  Respondent: 10773153 / Miles Palmer  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is
stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays

Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016
• 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
• 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
• 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.
If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5725  Respondent: 10774145 / P Jordan  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 – 2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burttcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.
The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to do. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Lurpham which is grid-locked every

Lurpham's sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England's requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an "aspiration" in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6962</th>
<th>Respondent: 10782689 / Murray Dudgeon</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.</td>
<td>The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.
The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4261  Respondent: 10785633 / Penelope Eagle  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.
It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.
The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6894  Respondent: 10796417 / Richard Shenton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.
The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 – 2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.
The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
3. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
4. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.
5. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
6. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/392  Respondent: 10798049 / Steve & Maureen Knight  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Support – although needs a new 4 way onto A3, probably meaning the Burpham on/off A3 access will need to be closed

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7933  Respondent: 10799425 / Guildford Greenbelt Group (Susan Parker)  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We object to policy A25 Gosden Hill

There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the green belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

If this development proceeds WEbelieve the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along...
the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

We object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below). The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
### Comment ID: pslp172/2434  Respondent: 10807745 / Belinda Middleton  Agent:

#### Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object that GBC are contravening the NPPF framework stipulation in paragraph 87 with the proposed developments at Gosden Hill Farm, Ripley, East and West Horsley and Garlicks Arch, Send. Paragraph 87 states “As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.” and GBC have not proven any special circumstance for developing on these Green Belt areas.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

### Comment ID: PSLPS16/5609  Respondent: 10809377 / Bernice Williams  Agent:

#### Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1) Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of Green Belt.

2) If this development proceeds, the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and West Clandon at this point will very likely be proposed for development in the future by the same developer who is promoting Gosden Hill.

3) The development will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford.

4) Together with the developments at Garlick’s Arch and Burnt Common there will be an almost uninterrupted ribbon of development along the A3 extending 5 miles north east from the centre of Guildford. Wisley village is 6½ miles and the M25 less than 8 miles from the centre of Guildford as the crow flies. They could all join up.

5) The development of this site will cause massive congestion in surrounding roads. It will generate many thousands of vehicle movements onto the A3 which is already at a crawl every day during peak periods.

6) The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7) The proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data: 2010 -2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 - A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays Surrey Fire and Rescue

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street -A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and sec is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.
The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham's sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development. The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England's requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an "aspiration" in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have heightened safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools. Currently, a two-way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4731</th>
<th>Respondent: 10811361 / Simon Crago</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Document:*** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

C.i. Policy 25 Gosden Hill

1. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt
2. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.
3. The development of this site will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
4. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress.
5. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
6. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which I understand is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4690</th>
<th>Respondent: 10816513 / Annmarie Shenton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Document:*** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.

4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.

5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6010  **Respondent:** 10816993 / Jane Roberts  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data
• Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
• Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
• Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
• Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

• 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

• 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
• 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
• 30 June 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see above and below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained. To allow this would be plain irresponsible.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.
Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
IOBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stat ionary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, 62215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham's sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.
Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England's requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an "aspiration" in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4032  Respondent: 10847521 / Andrew Procter  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1.1 I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.

1.2 There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

1.3 Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.

1.4 The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.

1.5 The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

1.6 The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

1.7 I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

1.8 The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

1.9 A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7905  Respondent: 10853697 / John Lobley  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I have been a resident of Burpham for over 30 years and view the Guildford Borough Council Draft Local Plan (“the Plan”) and its effect on the area and town in which I live with sheer horror and bewilderment. How it can be considered practical and necessary to have such an intensive and unsustainable development in an area where the infrastructure is already under pressure defies any logic and has complete and cynical disregard for the quality of life for the residents who will be affected. I have studied the content of the Plan and attended presentations by the Council where I voiced my concern about the impact on transport, schools, medical facilities and other infrastructure items. It was quite apparent that even the Council’s staff there present considered the impact of the proposal to build 2,000 homes on Gosden Hill (“GH”) alone would be catastrophic on an already overcrowded road network in Burpham. This is only one of many major proposals in the Plan which would degrade the lives of the residents of Guildford as a whole, but is by far and away the most destructive in terms of negative impact.

The destruction of the Green Belt around Burpham by the GH proposal is a travesty to the basic planning principles that have been honoured in post-war Britain, and is in direct contravention to promises given by the Government to voters in recent General Elections.

There is no evidence to support the need for such an intensive development in the Plan. Now that the Government has announced it will proceed with Brexit the need for housing will decrease and the Plan needs to be redrawn in terms of housing need. Sustainable development on existing brownfield sites is what is needed, not environmental destruction. Has anybody considered the effect the building of 2,000 homes on GH will mean in terms of lorry movements and pollution for local inhabitants?

Why is the Council concentrating so much of the development in one area? There is no clarity or transparency regarding the other bugbear for the Burpham area, namely the Slyfield area Plan and the related access road, which also proposes dramatic increases in HGV movements along Clay Lane, already congested due to the sheer amount of traffic and is potentially dangerous due to the number of schools on the route. If GH and Slyfield go ahead I shudder to think of the congestion that will occur on the access roads in the Burpham area.

The proposals to introduce a new train station and Park and Ride for GH will not in any way alleviate the impact of at least another 5,000 cars on our roads. The Plan should be shelved immediately as it does not represent the interests of Guildford residents as a whole, and those of Burpham in particular. There has been inadequate consultation for such a far-reaching and potentially catastrophic proposal.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3264</th>
<th>Respondent: 10854113 / Sarah Pickering</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WE OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 – 2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays

Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.
The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution, which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6802  **Respondent:** 10857249 / Alice Pashley  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.
I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.
Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4509  Respondent: 10857249 / Alice Pashley  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary everyday during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3494  Respondent: 10857889 / William Kyte OBE  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The changes to the policy are presented as a reduction in the development proposed. In reality, the changes are only a postponement into the next plan period and the same amount of Green Belt has been taken for development.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3946  Respondent: 10858945 / C P Faithful  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Burnt Common and Gosden Hill Farm developments are inappropriate and will overrun the local communities

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8260  Respondent: 10858977 / Angela Otterson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A25 Gosden Hill

There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

Gosden Hill is located entirely within the green belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,

The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3827  Respondent: 10859489 / Jennifer Procter  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1  POLICY A25 GOSDEN HILL

1.1  I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.

1.2  There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

1.3  Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,

1.4  The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity

1.5  The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

1.6  The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

1.7  I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

1.8  The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

1.9  A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6618  Respondent: 10864065 / Alec Mcindoe  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the proposed development of 2,000 homes at Gosden Hill Farm, which is currently in the Green Belt and in direct contravention of Central Government’s commitment to the protection of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/778  Respondent: 10865537 / Edwina Fassom  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.
The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4671  Respondent: 10865537 / Edwina Fassom  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: pslp172/4506  Respondent: 10867585 / Hugh Shanks  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4704  Respondent: 10868161 / Nicola Ford  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the GreenBelt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/5771  Respondent: 10868609 / Robert Lockie  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed development at Gosden Farm (Policy A25). This is opposite Potters lane in Send and the proposed 2000 homes, travellers pitches, employment space, retail centre etc would have a serious impact on Send and its infrastructure.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6376  Respondent: 10877249 / Ann Hamilton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The wholesale destruction of the Green Belt in this area (including the planned development of 2,000 homes at Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow – Policy A25) in clear contravention of the central government’s stated commitment to Green Belt protection.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5553  Respondent: 10878977 / Lisbet Hjort Jensen  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Green Belt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 where...
the traffic is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215, and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham's sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England's requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an "aspiration" in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like East and West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4426  **Respondent:** 10878977 / Lisbet Hjort Jensen  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.

4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.

5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/786  Respondent: 10882785 / Stephen Fleming  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

10. I object to the inclusion of the planned development of 2000 houses at Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow (Policy A25) in clear contravention of the Government's and Conservative councillors' election manifesto promises to protect the Green Belt. I object to the unsustainable nature of the site, the poor air quality and noise pollution levels that will result and the infrastructure deficit that will result.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4417  Respondent: 10883201 / Danny McHugh  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

C.i. Policy 25 Gosden Hill – My Objections

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4689  Respondent: 10884545 / Sarah O'Hagan  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/495</th>
<th>Respondent: 10884993 / Dave Fassom</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.
The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a
dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it
wants .

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be
uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over
West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around
14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s
requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in
the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow
for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been
carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and
safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4710  Respondent: 10884993 / Dave Fassom  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and
ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for
building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore,
Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban
Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If
this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at
this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon
development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in
conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send
through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads.
The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is
stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of
cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way
junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial
vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3145  
Respondent: 10889985 / Ruth Macdonald  
Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25  

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve: it provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land, all requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery and schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour onto the A3 which is already stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day, and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could do virtually whatever it wants.
The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime, given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and roads like the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill with which health and safety issues are associated.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4596  Respondent: 10889985 / Ruth Macdonald  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

C.i. Policy 25 Gosden Hill – My Objections

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6449</th>
<th>Respondent: 10890177 / Cheryl Burnside</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road
Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.
Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1358</th>
<th>Respondent: 10898721 / J Hawkins</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to site A25 Gosden Hill Farm as an overdevelopment in the Green Belt. Again this is contrary to the stated aim in the Plan of trying to keep the Green Belt incursions to a minimum. It would be further insidious erosion of the Green Belt and reducing the area of land available to absorb rainfall while also increasing traffic problems as the area of the A3 there is a busy stretch of road at present.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5527</th>
<th>Respondent: 10899233 / Frederick Hookins</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4087</th>
<th>Respondent: 10900257 / Mark Norman</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing at Gosden Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section page number** 724
I fail to understand how the SHMA has given a housing need higher than the estimate only four years ago. I believe the assumptions to be over estimated particularly now in the uncertain position of coming out of Europe and hence the reduction in migrant and London displaced population. These needs complete reconsideration.

Traffic generated by the Gosden Hill development.

There is only a suggestion of a 2 way new A3 southbound off and on intersection at Burpham, for the main access for the vehicles in the development as well as the park and ride. I estimated at over 3,000 cars will have to enter Burpham, use the A3100 (Clay Lane) to re-join the A3 northbound. This is already a heavily used road and since the building of Aldi the traffic has become worse, often queuing from the round about on Clay Lane back to the round about by Stoke Park. This cannot be sensible despite I'm sure relying on computer models - we all know they can be wrong and rely on a human building them and making assumptions in the first place. Assumptions can be adjusted to achieve the desired outcome.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4222  
Respondent: 10903265 / M Stokes  
Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the proposals being put forward in the latest draft local plan. Since the last Draft Local Plan of 2014 the GBC has managed to change every major site in Send. Originally in 2014 the plan proposed for 430 houses to be built in Send. In April 2016 this went down to 185 but now has just gone up to 485, 7000sq m of industrial warehousing and a massive new road junction at Burnt Common onto the A3!

I understand that GBC cannot make these significant changes without going through another full consultation under Regulation 18 and not as you are trying to do and short cut the system. Does this not invalidate the whole process?

I also understand that the GBC’s transport assessment was not available to councillors when the vote was taken in May this year. Obviously it wasn’t an important enough issue for you before the vote was taken!?

1. **I object to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt.** With the proposed development of 2000 homes at Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow - Policy A25 there will be wholesale destruction of the Green Belt in this area. Which is in clear contravention of the central government's stated commitment to the protection of the Green Belt. Send acts as an essential buffer between Woking and Guildford and stops it becoming one large conurbation. NPPG83 states that the Green Belt should only be altered in “exceptional circumstances”. There are no exceptional circumstances in Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1699  
Respondent: 10905185 / D White  
Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to the removal of 89 ha of Green Belt at Gosden Hill Farm. This valuable farmland is desperately needed to help reduce the need for imported fresh foodstuffs. Despite the suggested road improvements the development proposal will, without doubt, have a detrimental effect on the existing areas of Burpham and Merrow. The "Allocation" box in Policy statement A25 clearly shows, without any doubt, how Guildford Borough Council supports the environmental Armageddon of this part of the Borough. Adding together all the proposed uses, it is absolutely obvious that the Burpham area will be a place to avoid. Congestion caused by housing, schools, shopping, general employment, Park and Ride and other proposals will add to the traffic nightmare current on the A3.

To put it simply, wasn't the A3 improved to REMOVE traffic from peripheral villages?

Perhaps you have forgotten!

Finally, perhaps you will be able to explain to the Public Inquiry Inspector why Guildford Borough Council is encouraging developers to progress housing proposals as soon as possible. Could it be that Guildford Borough Council is attempting a series of "fait accompli" in advance of any Inspector's decision?

Please ensure this letter of Objection is presented to the Public Inquiry Inspector.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4265  Respondent: 10906145 / Joe Gervasio  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Gosden Hill development (A25)

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF.

This Green Belt site prevents the sprawl of Guildford town, and together with other Green Belt sites in the plan, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight an historic village.

The development would generate in the region of 4,000 vehicles which will naturally use the A3 which is already stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and also through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon would be so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon, Send, Ripley and Wisley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4800  Respondent: 10910369 / Karen Doyle  Agent:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6686</th>
<th>Respondent: 10912513 / Sarah Green</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong>*</td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7204</th>
<th>Respondent: 10912513 / Sarah Green</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong>*</td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to the inclusion of the planned development of 2000 houses at Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow (Policy A25) in clear contravention of the Government’s and Conservative councillors’ election manifesto promises to protect the Green Belt. I object to the unsustainable nature of the site, the poor air quality and noise pollution levels that will result and the infrastructure deficit that will result.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7224</th>
<th>Respondent: 10917985 / Alan Stephenson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong>*</td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am particularly concerned at the proposed development of the Gosden Hill Farm site which will have a massive adverse impact on the Burpham area of the Borough. The existing infrastructure will not support this development and a decision is required on a tunnel before any development of this site can be considered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3805  Respondent: 10919841 / J.A. Millard  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I STRONGLY OBJECT to the planned development of 2,000 homes at Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow. This is another enormous development that will destroy another significant area of an already badly eroded Surrey. This is not answering the needs of the local community and will totally overwhelm the local infrastructure. When will this greed and stupidity end?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4786  Respondent: 10920001 / Jeff Doyle  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4512  Respondent: 10922913 / Henry Dowson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in
conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from
encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Secondly the Gosden Hill development will lead to a substantial increase in traffic on the local roads especially the A3100 London Road in Burslem. The new Clay Lane link road from Slyfield will similarly add to the volume of traffic. One of the worst features of the new plan is the failure to provide a four way interchange to enable Clay Lane southbound and Gosden Hill northbound traffic to reach the A3 without travelling along the A3100. The resultant traffic jams on a road already subject to frequent delays will certainly be to the detriment of local residents. There will also be a severe increase in pollution and noise affecting the residents as well as children walking to the George Abbot school and pedestrians walking to the local shops and supermarkets. According to the aspirations set out in the Neighbourhood Plan only recently accepted by GBC developments should be "promoting high quality change and improvement" and "preserving and enhancing quality of life." It cannot be said that the new local plan achieves that result.

We therefore object to the Local Plan 2016 version.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Regarding the Gosden Hill proposal. I notice this has an A3 junction, but IT’S NOT 4 WAY!!! This will mean that all traffic heading north has to come through Burslem to get onto Clay Lane and the existing junction, this is unacceptable. Many of us for years have been saying that our three A3 junctions all need to be made 4 way, when is this going to happen? I do not regard a tunnel under Guildford as a cost effective solution at all, it would be far better to spend that money up north, all we need is the junctions made 4-way please.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford. The Plan does not put forward any
evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt. The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement putting pedestrians at risk. Note that young families use the pavement to access Clandon school and everyday during rush hour traffic they put their lives in danger as no workable traffic calming measures have been implemented that prevent vehicles from mounting the pavement to pass each other at pinch points in the road or to manage the excessive speed of vehicles passing through the village.

I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

A new en-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England's requirement of 2km. Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.
I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.
Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays

Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road
Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.
Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4586  **Respondent:** 10944385 / Clare Benzikie  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

C.i. Policy 25 Gosden Hill – My Objections

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2198  **Respondent:** 10944513 / Amber Ellis  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25
I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from
encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/741  **Respondent:** 10945057 / Margaret Field  **Agent:** 
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

1. I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4520  **Respondent:** 10946721 / Gillian Allen  **Agent:** 
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1423  **Respondent:** 10952705 / Moira Maidment  **Agent:** 
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

---
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data: 2010-2014 from Crashmap data

- Clnrlnn C:rn;c; Rn;lc; ArP tn R11Ilc; HPrl - I7 irfPntc;
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- TithPh m I ;me tn Pnrtc;mni 1th R nrl h l1nc;e - R inrlPnts

2015

- 21Oct 2015 - A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays Surrey Fire and Rescue

7016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street - A247 closed in both directions
  - 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
  - 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors untilthey pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.
The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham's sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England's requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an "aspiration" in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West dandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7073  Respondent: 10953249 / Charlotte Ladd  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays

Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from...
encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4208</th>
<th>Respondent: 10953793 / Hugh Thomas</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the proposals for Gosden Hill because they breach the Green Belt, put West Clandon in danger of being joined up to Guildford and will generate excessive extra traffic for Send.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1103</th>
<th>Respondent: 10954913 / Pete Rollo</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( Yes ), is Sound? ( Yes ), is Legally Compliant? ( Yes )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe the housing development proposed at Gosden Hill Farm is misguided because it will bring additional burden on overstretched public facilities-road congestion, parking, school places, medical facilities, shops, leisure facilities and transport such as trains and buses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4719</th>
<th>Respondent: 10955489 / Ian Carter</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2178  **Respondent:** 10957025 / Pauline Masters  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

---

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

---

1. **POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm**

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  
Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016
Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.
If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4635  Respondent: 10957025 / Pauline Masters  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

C.i. Policy25 Gosden Hill – My Objections
I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below). The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution, which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two-way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England's requirement of 2km.
Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an "aspiration" in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4230  Respondent: 10959009 / Rebecca Claridge  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcots Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.
If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/8188  
**Respondent:** 10959265 / Inger & Ron Ward  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two-way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.
There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/8212  **Respondent:** 10959265 / Inger & Ron Ward  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.
The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants .

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/5239  **Respondent:** 10960033 / Lucinda Kalupka  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?**

1. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West...
Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham's sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England's requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an "aspiration" in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6488  
**Respondent:** 10960353 / Trish White  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site A25 Gosden Hill Farm - massive overdevelopment of 2000 homes in the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4429  
**Respondent:** 10962657 / Amanda Leader  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.
No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.

2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.

4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.

5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.
The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4518  **Respondent:** 10967649 / Ian Cornwall  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attatched documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6101  Respondent: 10968129 / Sheila Remnant  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Whilst we appreciate more housing is needed - to build 2000 houses on the Gosden Hill site would double the size of Burpham and triple the amount of traffic through Burpham. This could mean that to work/shop/visit Guildford for local people would become a nightmare. If Gosden Hill is to have it's own infrastructure ie doctors, dentist, shopping and schools then it should have it's own road system so that its traffic does not spoil Burpham even more. Moreover, what with the development of Garlicks Arch and Wisley Airfield there would be no green belt left between Guildford and Ripley - soon we will be joined to Kingston - then London! I understand there is also similar developments proposed for the south of Guildford which could also join us onto Farnham eventually.

At the BCA meeting we were told that the NHS are unlikely to fund a doctors surgery on Gosden Hill. How are the present two surgeries in Burpham and Merrow going to cope with the additional number of patients? There are many problems to be sorted/resolved before any building is even considered.

Gosden Hill is greenbelt land. It used to be a farm until a builder (Martin Grant) bought the farmhouse and land (obviously with an eye to build houses in the future). Once green belt land - stated as essential for its openness and permanence - has been allocated for building it will be lost forever. Brown field land should be considered and built on first before greenbelt is even considered and this only as a last resort.

The Plan does not offer sufficient evidence of exceptional circumstances to justify allocating green belt land for strategic development. Burpham in particular has already lost two farms - Weylea and Keens Farm now Weybrook Park to building. The loss of these green areas has contributed heavily to more traffic (as has the Aldi store which should never have been given permission to build on that site) and loss of being a 'village' and all that means to us. Haven't we done enough in Burpham?

I had heard that Rokers in Holly Lane are tendering an application to build a large estate with schools - this has not been mentioned in the Plan but could solve some of the housing need problems and mean that time could be given to solve the
traffic problems on the north side of Guildford before any consideration is given again to the Gosden Hill site. I notice that Liddington Hall has not been mentioned again or even any sites at Normandy. Why is this?

The Strategic Housing Market Assessment states a housing need number of 693 per year and this is double the figure given only four years ago. The worry that large houses are intended to be built on Gosden Hill which could make this a dormitory site for London commuters. There is a greater need for smaller properties to enable local young people to live in or near the area in which they grew up and near their friends. My own children have had to go further afield to be able to afford to purchase properties, and this is such a shame.

All this proposed building just adds up to more noise, more traffic and more importantly more pollution.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. The loss of Green Belt land, more specifically the proposed Green Belt development at Gosden Hill.

1. Tunnelling of the A3 should be agreed before Gosden Hill is planned for development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4176  Respondent: 10969441 / Mark Woodman  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing in response to the revised Local Plan out for consultation. I don’t believe you have addressed the objections I raised previously. I also believe the Draft Local Plan is still unsound and unsustainable. My objections are listed below:

You are trying to build far too many houses in Guildford. I know we need more housing but they need to be of the right type with affordable ones for first time buyers. Where do your figures come from? We do not need nearly 14,000 new homes in Guildford.

2,000 new homes on Gosden Hill would be a huge mistake. The infrastructure simply is not there and Burpham cannot take any more traffic. The roads are already blocked every day, the pollution is in excess of permissible levels and will only get worse. The thousands of vehicles that will be generated that will mostly travel through Burpham is dangerous for pedestrians and for all our health. You recently allowed the Aldi application who have since then broken every planning restriction originally passed and now the large lorries are numerous, dangerous and heavily polluting.

You should be looking at rerouting the A3 around Guildford, even in a tunnel under Guildford. Three lanes into two lanes as currently through Guildford causes gridlock most days and when there is an accident all that traffic goes through Burpham. That is just crazy and dangerous and seriously harms our health.

You cannot take our Green Belt away. Housing in Gosden Hill is in our Green Belt and with such plans you are eventually going to join Guildford up with Woking and/or Clandon. You need to safeguard our countryside from encroachment, from merging into other towns and preserve the character of Burpham.

For all the above reasons I strongly object to the Guildford Borough Council Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4383  Respondent: 10970497 / Michael Cook  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.

5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6261  Respondent: 10972065 / Sarah Cocke  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data
• Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
• Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
• Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
• Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

• 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

• 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
• 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
• 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.
Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.
Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4446  Respondent: 10986689 / Richard Harris  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4056  Respondent: 10987137 / Susan Wong  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A25 Gosden Hill
Allocation

The number of homes has not been changed just stated in a slightly different way implying that the number has changed “Approximately 2000 homes of which a minimum of 1700 homes will be delivered within the plan period”. There will also be schools, businesses, shops, a station and a Park and Ride all with vehicles wanting to use the roads.

Infrastructure

The proposed 2 way junction for Gosden Hill will lead to even more grid lock than is currently experienced in Burpham. All traffic wanting to access the northbound A3 or Guildford will have to travel through Burpham. Local traffic wanting to access the new A3 southbound slip road will have to travel through Burpham. The traffic has already increased with the new Aldi store.

When there is a problem on the A3, Burpham grinds to a halt and all those vehicles are giving off fumes affecting the health of Burpham residents. It is proposed the present 1 way 2 lane slip road off the A3 at Burpham becomes 2 way. What will happen when there is an accident or breakdown – gridlock. Other proposals being considered – Slyfield, Clay Lane Link Road and others - will all add to the traffic in Burpham.

Access to Gosden Hill Village

There is only one access/egress to the proposed development which is unsafe. If there is an accident or breakdown blocking the road at the roundabout there could be a very serious problem as emergency vehicles may not be able to get through. There is mention of a through route in the Opportunities section but no sign of the location of this route or evidence of a protected route.

Sustainable Movement Corridor

The developer is required to provide the eastern route section of the Sustainable Movement Corridor on the site and make a contribution to delivering the eastern route section on the Local Road Network. The local roads already have increasing times and occasions of gridlock. How can increasing the traffic by the proposed amounts be provided on roads where there is only room for 2 lanes? Has anyone actually visited or surveyed the area?

A3 Tunnel

In the Guildford borough Transport Strategy 2017 there are references to the A3 Guildford Tunnel under the Aspirations heading. Has any thought been given to the land needed for a tunnel? Gosden Hill is the logical choice and should be protected not built on.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.
It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Higgoles Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.
The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7032  **Respondent:** 10987905 / Marika Chandler  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon,
gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass
the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with
paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from
encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All
requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus
shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history
going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before
the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day
during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow,
winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send
and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two
schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham
which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous
cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a
dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it
wants .

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be
uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over
West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around
14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s
requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in
the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow
for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been
carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and
safety issues.
1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3911  Respondent: 10990145 / Anne Lee  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4632  Respondent: 10987905 / Marika Chandler  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below and elsewhere).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.
If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4728  Respondent: 10990145 / Anne Lee  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip road to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is gridlocked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.
Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which raise health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4581</th>
<th>Respondent: 10992225 / Emma Ringshaw</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3347</th>
<th>Respondent: 10992833 / Amanda Verny White</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays

Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.
The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A25 Gosden Hill Farm I object because development far too large causing loss of ancient woodland and traffic chaos.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/179  Respondent: 10995233 / Pam Harnor  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed development at Gosden Hill as 2000 additional homes will have a devastating affect on traffic flows in the area as well as removing significant Green Belt forever.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2051  Respondent: 10995297 / Peter Cormack  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Gosden Hill development of 1700 houses. Reference to a potential link road from the development to the A247. The clear implication is for an access from the development to the A247 with enormous traffic implications for the A247.

South bound off- and on- slip roads to service the development and replace the existing off- slip road to Burpham. The only North bound access to the A3 will be via the existing slip road off Clay Lane. (See later, Burnt Common).

A 4-entry form secondary school, a primary school, a retail centre and a park and ride for up to 700 cars.

When developed, the new employment site at the north side of Gosden Hill Farm (site allocation A25) will be treated as an Office and Research & Development Strategic Employment Site (7000sq.m). This could mean several hundred employees.

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon.
development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3209  Respondent: 10997121 / Rob Curling  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015
• 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays

Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

• 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
• 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
• 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.
The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
• Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
• Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
• Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

• 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

• 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
• 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
• 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.
Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/5676 **Respondent:** 10998081 / David Marshall **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford. The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt. The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement. Note the following accident data: 2010 –2014 from Crashmap data
• Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head -- 17 incidents
• Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way -- 8 incidents
• Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane -- 15 incidents
• Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close -- 8 incidents

2015

• 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage -- Three vehicles collided causing delays - Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed

2016

• 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
• 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
• 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon -- a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off–slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87–89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid–locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.
A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km. Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3. Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6964</th>
<th>Respondent: 11007393 / James Culmer</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 – 2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays

  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016
Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.
If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1832</th>
<th>Respondent: 11008225 / Russell Pascoe</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1432  Respondent: 11010273 / Dave Brownjohn  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A3 Corridor Development

- There is a disproportionate number of new homes and associated development on Gosden Hill Farm, which will significantly and adversely change the appearance and nature of Burpham the area, and the north eastern side of Guildford in its entirety
- The combined developments of Wisley and Gosden Hill Farm represent too large a proportion of the overall Guildford plan developments, bearing in mind that of the proposed 13,860 homes approx. 5,000 homes will be on this side of Guildford (incl about 1,000 homes in Send, Horsley, Burnt Common and Ripley in smaller individual developments)
- There has been no clear justification for the number of 13,860 new homes to be built in Guildford, plus the consequent need of more employment space. How was this figure obtained? Just telling us that independent consultants were employed is not sufficient.

The proposed designation of the employment site on Gosden Hill Farm as a Strategic Employment Site lacks any definitive justification, and will lead to increasing commercial development in future years, and thence to increased stress
on the local infrastructure. It will further deteriorate the attraction of the local area to the disadvantage of existing Burpham and Clandon residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3448  Respondent: 11010401 / J M Bates  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
- Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road
Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.
Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4559  Respondent: 11010401 / J M Bates  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4196  Respondent: 11011585 / Martin Walker  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Section page number  Page 381 of 788  Document page number  795
I object to the proposed development of 2000 houses at Gosden Hill as it will destroy large areas of Green Belt and agricultural land and produce congestion on the A3 and surrounding roads including Send.

I object to the fact that this site was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon previously. Full consultation is required.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1767  Respondent: 11012097 / John & Jean Waters  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the development of over 2000 houses at Wisley Airfield. The impact this will have on our villages will be huge and our infrastructure such as it is, will be unable to cope with the extra traffic.

Overall, it is extremely disappointing that all the local villages will be subject to such development changes and our Green Belt will be lost for ever.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6700  Respondent: 11012129 / William Lawrence  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. The proposed development at Gosden Hill Farm is clearly unsustainable. It does not promote a positive improvement in the quality of the natural environment, or an enhancement of the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscape.

There will be an unavoidable loss of bio-diversity with no recognition of the wider benefits of a sustainable ecosystem and does not provide net gains in biodiversity. This development will create a significant loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats.

This is evidenced in the massive loss of biodiversity associated with previous developments in the locality, (Weylea, Weybrook, etc.).

This proposal does not establish coherent ecological networks that are resilient to current and future pressures. There is no plan for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of adequate networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure. Nor does this aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity by locating to an alternative site with less harmful impacts.

NPF118. NPPF114. NPPF9.
1. The plan does not empower local people to shape their surroundings and there is little regard for local or regional issues such as excessive traffic, congested traffic and the associated loss of amenity. The planned schools, railway station, park and ride and retail centre will clearly draw large volumes of motor vehicles through the village of Burpham, which is already well above capacity to a point of daily gridlock.

There will be no improvement in the conditions in which people live, work and take leisure. The massive increase in traffic with the associated air pollution will cause a catastrophic reduction in air quality. Indeed, there is clearly overwhelming local opposition to the Gosden Hill Farm development in particular, and the Guildford Draft Local Plan in general.

1. The plan does not protect or recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside or support existing communities. Gosden Hill Farm is the last of many working farms left in the village of Burpham. Its loss will impact gravely on the nature and community of the village. This plan will remove land from the rural economy and does not pay regard to future agricultural need for productive farmland. NPPF 17.

There has been no taking into account the economic and other benefits of this agricultural land, and no assessment of future needs. NPPF112.

1. This plan will encourage the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas. It will effectively merge villages and destroy the intrinsic identity of communities. It will remove any safeguards protecting the countryside from encroachment. NPPF 80.

1. There has been no Strategic Flood Risk Assessment or assessments of the physical constraints on land use. NPPF35

1. This plan does not encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed and has lesser environmental value. Recent developments within Guildford town centre have replaced land originally used for housing with retail, business and car-parking usage. There has been no genuine assessment of all available brownfield land within the borough. The Gosden Hill Farm site uses virgin quality farmland.

1. There is no plan for reducing pollution or minimising its effects including the cumulative effects on health, the natural environment and general amenity on the local and natural environment. The large increase in vehicle traffic, including delivery lorries, and congested traffic, caused by this plan will cause a dramatic increase in both air and noise pollution. The School, housing and retail centre will also generate vast amounts of light pollution. NPPF110, NPPF120.

1. There has been no genuine assessment of infrastructure needs nor forecast for future demands. There is no proposal for a decentralised energy supply or promotion of energy from renewable and low carbon sources. NPPF96.

1. This Plan does not take any account of longer term climate change, including factors such as flood risk, water supply and changes to biodiversity and landscape. There has been no management of risks through suitable adaptation measures, with no planning of green infrastructure.

There is no plan for a transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate. All routes are essentially for motor vehicles. There is no genuine plan for alternative transport systems (e.g. trams etc.) to link with the town centre. NPPF 99.

Essentially the Guildford Draft Local Plan does not provide a considered proposal for sustainable development.

The Gosden Hill development is ill conceived and its location has been chosen for reasons of ownership rather than suitability. Burpham and Merrow have already had considerable development during the late twentieth century, losing many of their traditional farms to housing and retail. This area has already had considerable development and the proposal will cause an unbalanced expansion of Guildford causing an excessive load on the local infrastructure.

This plan will destroy the identity of Burpham village, other existing villages, and their communities by their merging into a suburban sprawl.
The biodiversity of Burpham is already in sharp decline and has had no proper assessment. This proposal to develop its last working farm will destroy much that remains with no effective mitigation proposals.

There is no proposal to mitigate increased air, water, noise and light pollution from motor vehicles, commercial development and domestic dwellings. Neither are there proposals to mitigate any impact on wildlife from vehicles and their associated infrastructure.

The infrastructure has not been considered holistically. The dramatic increase in road networks will not solve the traffic management problems, but rather add to them.

There are no pragmatic proposals to provide energy (e.g. solar/wind farms) for this development nor to effectively deal with the extra generation of waste including water and refuse.

The basis on which this plan is conceived is far from robust. No genuine assessment can be achieved from these nonspecific proposals. There has been little accurate assessment of current bio diversity, air quality, water pollution, drinking water availability, waste disposal capacity, energy needs and energy generation capacity.

For these reasons the Draft Local Plan should be re-considered. New sites explored and alternative solutions sought.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2709  **Respondent:** 11015745 / David Howells  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I continue to object to the 2017 New Local Plan. Whilst the plan is extensive and covers the whole borough, I will confine my comments to those specifically relating to Gosden Hill Farm (Policy A25).

My objections are:

1. The proposed new junction off the A3 is inadequate and will have a devastating effect on traffic flows in the area:

   During peak periods traffic already tails back on to the A3 even with a lengthy slip road up to the first roundabout at the junction with Great Oaks Park. The plans do not appear to allow for even a similar length slip road, let alone sufficient for the extra volumes of traffic which must be associated with the Gosden Hill development and other developments proposed in the area such as the Slyfield Area Regeneration Project (SARP). There will therefore be increased traffic queues tailing back onto the A3 which will lead to additional levels of congestion, accidents and injury on this major trunk road. The positioning of the junction nearer to the bend in the A3 will also reduce the sightlines ahead of the junction further increasing the road hazard.

   1. All of the northbound traffic coming from the new development at Gosden Hill will be forced to drive into Burpham before taking the existing junction northbound. Southbound traffic for SARP will also take this new junction with consequent traffic gridlock right through the centre of Burpham.

   2. Any new road infrastructure must come before the development starts. With Highways England considering its wider plans for the A3 through Guildford over the next three years it seems short sighted to include a new exit off the A3 which may have to be substantially reconfigured when Highways England's plans become clearer. Indeed, plans to install a new junction with the B2215 and A247 or a new tunnel might be prejudiced by the new Gosden Hill junction. Any development should therefore be subject to Highways England's strategic development plan.

   3. The plans for a park and ride facility as part of the Gosden Hill Facility appear to have been watered down to that required by 'projected demand'. Projected by who? Demand will be created by good supply and will reduce the numbers
automatically using their cars. The policy also has an apparent conflict as there is no land allocated to park and ride (deleted in first section) yet there is a requirement in the next section to provide Park and Ride, albeit in the vague terms described above.

4. We are already seeing an increase in static vehicles on the London Road with the attendant nitrogen dioxide and particulates pollution. Studies have shown the dangers to public health associated with these harmful pollutants so it is hard to understand why planning policy should include proposals which will increase their levels. Reference is made to the developer contributing to the Sustainable Movement Corridor along the A3 100 yet the plans to improve movements along the route are unclear. There is no space to widen the road to accommodate an extra lane for buses, taxis or cyclists so what is being proposed? It seems that the Eastern section of the Corridor is more aspirational than a plan (GBC update June 2016) and needs to be worked up properly for public consultation before the Local Plan is submitted for approval. The implementation timescale in Appendix C should also precede any development at Gosden Hill.

The opportunities listed include the potential to provide a through route within the site to divert the B2234 to form a more direct link to the A3. This would appear to conflict with the protection of green spaces designated by the Burpham Neighbourhood Plan and should therefore be deleted rather than usurp the authority vested in the Neighbourhood Forum.

I note that secondary educational need will now only be assessed when the planning application is 'determined', rather than when it is 'made'. I may be being pedantic, but it does seem that the need for secondary education should be established as part of the application itself. Otherwise a planning application could provide for no educational facility and be approved at which point the Council starts to think about educational provision, only to find there is no land left locally on which to build new facilities.

Hence, I believe that the wording should be changed back to 'made'. As requested by the latest consultation, I have restricted my comments above to the highlighted changes in the updated Local Plan. In no way should they be taken to mean that I agree with the appropriation of Green Belt land for development. I am implacably opposed to the development of the Green Belt and am far from convinced about the need for additional housing at the levels discussed in the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1061  Respondent: 11023585 / Jean Walker  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.
Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4566</th>
<th>Respondent: 11023585 / Jean Walker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
• The local adjoining roads do not have sufficient capacity (especially at rush hour) to take additional traffic that would be generated by this development.
• Public transport is not sufficient meeting demand of potential additional passengers to encourage vehicles to be left at home to undertake local journeys.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4433  Respondent: 11032801 / Louise Springfield  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green. Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6791  Respondent: 11036801 / Judith Mercer  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to POLICY(site)A25 GOSDEN HILL FARM,Merrow Lane
This is another site proposed for considerable building on the Green Belt. For all the reasons as already mentioned above, this would amount to gross violation of Green Belt land and countryside. Development here would by its very nature irreversibly harm the Green Belt because the site contributes to the purposes of the Green Belt in accordance with the National policy laid down in NPPF, including to prevent urban sprawl.

This site covers a vast area and would affect several of the Green Belt villages in the area. It would increase air pollution, traffic congestion, quality of living and general wellbeing. It would adversely affect not only those in the immediate vicinity but all of Guildford town itself, putting extreme pressure on infrastructure already overwhelmed, and more stress on the everyday public and medical services for the borough. The impact would be felt far and wide.

There is no 'need' or "special circumstances" given for this number of homes. If another school is felt to be required for Guildford then the Council must first consider areas of brownfield rather than sacrifice our Green Belt land.

It is imperative that we retain as much green space, trees, fields and wildlife habitat that we can manage to provide for better air quality, light and reduction of noise for the area. This proposed site would cause harm to all those things to the permanent detriment of the local environment.

This land could also be used for farming and food production which is of national importance.

Once these fields are built on they are gone forever.

For these reasons I OBJECT to this site being included in the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3223</th>
<th>Respondent: 11036801 / Judith Mercer</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Policy A25 Gosden Hill
I object to the above changed policy for development of 1700 homes because:

- There is no proven need for housing on this site because the housing target is incorrect, inflated and ignores constraints.
- Gosden Hill is located entirely in Green Belt land. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site. The above policy is in breach of NPPF paras 87-89. This site serves all 5 functions of Green Belt (NPPF para 80).
- I object to any form of link road being built. It would cause irreparable harm to the local roads and detrimental impact on already congested area. No common sense is being applied with regard to this policy whatsoever.
- No attempt has been made to evaluate properly the detriment to local and national road structures. Highways England has not approved a new on slip at Burpham and it would be against their requirements.

In view of all the above this policy is misguided and wrong and should be deleted from the local plan 2017.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4828  Respondent: 11039681 / Bruce Jeffreson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2974  Respondent: 11040609 / Simon Long  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4376  Respondent: 11041025 / Debra Somner Fraser  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

C. Specific Policy Objections:

C.i. Policy 25 Gosden Hill – My Objections

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon
at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3330  **Respondent:** 11041121 / Catherine Dean  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( )  **is Sound?** ( )  **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I object to Policy A25 Gosden Hill Farm.

1. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating the parish of West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce, defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and the houses along The Street in West Clandon (owned by the same developer as Gosden Hill Farm) will come under enormous pressure. Since the 2014 Draft Plan was withdrawn, the area under consideration has been enlarged in the direction of West Clandon.

1. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a slip road provision at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

1. The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

1. The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A-road. In places it is under 5m wide and too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement (see also below).

1. **I object** most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon-a road which is already under traffic stress (see also below) and which Surrey County Council say cannot be improved.
Policy A25 Gosden Hill – Objections

- Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of Green Belt.
- If this development proceeds, the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and West Clandon at this point will very likely be proposed for development in the future by the same developer who is promoting Gosden Hill.
- The development will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford.
- Together with the developments at Garlick’s Arch and Burnt Common there will be an almost uninterrupted ribbon of development along the A3 extending 5 miles north east from the centre of Guildford. Wisley village is 6½ miles and the M25 less than 8 miles from the centre of Guildford as the crow flies. They could all join up.
- The development of this site will cause massive congestion in surrounding roads. It will generate many thousands of vehicle movements onto the A3 which is already at a crawl every day during peak periods.
- The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
- The proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of the Green Belt on Gosden Hill Farm A25 for the same reasons as above

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2471  Respondent:  11043553 / Geraldine Banks  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green. Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays

  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.
A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4695</th>
<th>Respondent: 11043553 / Geraldine Banks</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1068</th>
<th>Respondent: 11043585 / Judith Chapman-Hatchett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This is an excessive development, there is already significant traffic issues through Send, the road infrastructure in Send will be unable to cope with inevitable increased traffic. This is a wholesale destruction of the Green Belt in clear contravention of the Government’s stated commitment for Green Belt protection. This principle will also allow for the presumed further development of other Green Belt areas locally.

The development of Homes should be shared around the borough, not so focused around Ripley and Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6794  Respondent: 11044129 / Christopher Barrass   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

• Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
• Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
• Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
• Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

• 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays

Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016
Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.
If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4524  Respondent: 11044129 / Christopher Barrass  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green. Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/1042  Respondent: 11045185 / Paul Chapman-Hatchett  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This an excessive development, there is already significant traffic issues through Send, the road infrastructure in Send will be unable to cope with inevitable increased traffic. This is a wholesale destruction of the Green Belt in clear contravention of the Government's stated commitment for Green Belt protection. This principle will also allow for the presumed further development of other Green Belt areas locally.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2244  Respondent: 11047329 / Hazel Corstin  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays

Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.
2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.
The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

I object as a new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4003  Respondent: 11047329 / Hazel Corstin  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

6. I object to Policy A25 Gosden Hill Farm, in that even though housing numbers at this site on the surface seem to have been revised slightly downward to 1700 from 2000, in actual fact the wording in Policy A25 now states ‘Approximately 2,000 homes of which a minimum of 1,700 homes will be delivered within the plan period’. This seems to be attempting to indicate a change which in reality may not exist, and is misleading.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6260  Respondent: 11047873 / Mary Waldner  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.
It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 – 2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.
The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
area is utterly inadequate to cope with the additional need for roads, sewers, medical facilities and schools. My principal objection though is that these, along with the proposed developments at Wisley airfield and Garlick's Arch, would lead to a continuous solid development from the A3 junction with the M25 through Ripley, Send and Burpham to Guildford. Along with the development that is already going to occur in Send, through the building of housing on the old Vision Engineering site when their existing factory is demolished after the new one is completed (permission already granted), we have potentially a nightmare scenario where Guildford is developed to the M25 along the A3, A247 and B2215 corridor. 70% of the identified "housing need" for the Borough in this utterly flawed plan is proposed to be catered for in this area. It is utterly disproportionate, and the villages to the north-east of Guildford are to be destroyed to save Guildford itself. The planners should be identifying brown field sites within Guildford to build, rather than cravenly caving in to the pressure from developers who want to harvest the low hanging fruit of building on Green Belt land. The legislation was intended in 1947 to avoid precisely this sort of thing taking place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3447  **Respondent:** 11049473 / Victor Bates  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays

Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.
2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.
The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays

  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.
I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4-way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.
Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2565  Respondent: 11053825 / Claire Owen  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.
If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6027  **Respondent:** 11054049 / Clare Goodall  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? () , is Sound? () , is Legally Compliant? ()**

1. **POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm**

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015
• 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays

Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

• 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
• 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
• 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.
The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1738  Respondent: 11069601 / Barry Kiddell  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A25.

It could never satisfy Policy S1.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7522  Respondent: 11070113 / Alison Hague  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

13. POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development
proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement. There is also very limited visibility from some houses, businesses and amenities for vehicles turning onto The Street or for pedestrians trying to cross The Street (e.g. Clandon railway station approach, Onslow Arms car park, Bull's Head car park, West Clandon church car park).

Note the following accident data: 2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015


2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road
- July 2016 Collision outside Onslow Arms resulting in one vehicle ending up in garden of cottage opposite

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.
It is estimated the development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day, and where there are already difficulties accessing properties, businesses and amenities, and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4192  **Respondent:** 11070113 / Alison Hague  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**Policy A25 GOSDEN HILL – My Objections**

1) Gosden Hill development of 1700 houses. Reference to a potential link road from the development to the A247. The clear implication is for an access from the development to the A247 with enormous traffic implications for the A247.

2) South bound off- and on- slip roads to service the development and replace the existing off- slip road to Burpham. The only North bound access to the A3 will be via the existing slip road off Clay Lane. (See later, Burnt Common).

3) A 4-entry form secondary school, a primary school, a retail centre and a park and ride for up to 700 cars.
4) When developed, the new employment site at the north side of Gosden Hill Farm (site allocation A25) will be treated as an Office and Research & Development Strategic Employment Site (7000sq.m). This could mean several hundred employees.

5) The development of this site will cause massive congestion in surrounding roads. It will generate many thousands of vehicle movements onto the A3 which is already at a crawl every day during peak periods.

6) The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7) The proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress.

8) The A247 through West Clandon is not suited to cope with additional traffic for reasons including: (i) although notionally an A-road the A247 is narrow and winding in parts and is most unsuited to carrying additional traffic, (ii) the A247 has a single non-continuous footpath in several sections, (iii) a care home, a church car park and a pub, as well as very many houses, are located on the opposite side of the road to the only footpath, making pedestrian access difficult for people moving about the village on foot, especially for elderly and disabled people; (iv) the railway station and other commercial and residential properties have poor sight lines for access onto the A247 and difficulties in accessing the A247 from these properties will be exacerbated by increased traffic volume (and fewer “gaps” between cars); (v) the A247 is popular with cyclists and because of its narrow and winding nature the potential for accidents that additional traffic will cause is clear.

9) I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too many.

10) There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

11) Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of Green Belt.

12) The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.

13) The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

14) The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion on surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3. The A3 is at a crawl every day during peak periods, and often at weekends as well. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

15) I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress.

16) The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

17) A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.
18) The A247 may be an A-road on the map but in reality it is a residential road with numerous bends, narrow sections and side-entrances. The road through West Clandon already has numerous accident black spots, such as: (i) the exit from Clandon station which has extremely poor sight lines due to a humped back bridge where numerous accidents have occurred; (ii) the exit from the Onslow Arms pub which is almost blind due to the pub building being adjacent the road - a vehicle has recently ended up in the garden of the cottage opposite; (iii) the narrow section outside “Summers” which is regularly littered with the wing mirrors of cars which have made contact, as well as being a dangerous area for pedestrians due to vehicles mounting the pavement to try to pass; (iv) the winding section outside Clandon Regis and near the primary school which regularly suffers from demolition of gate posts and fences as vehicles leave the road; (v) the bend near West Clandon church which has seen damage caused to the flint wall in recent years.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6060</th>
<th>Respondent: 11074465 / Louise Vaughan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )</td>
<td>is Sound? ( )</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and West Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure for development.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch, give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt. The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used, and is recognised by borough and county councils as being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data:

- Clandon cross roads area to Bulls Head pub - 17 incidents
- Bulls Head pub to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015:

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays - Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed
2016:
- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burnt Common and M25 J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 June 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital - Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Green Belt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space, and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement every day and through Send and Ripley, which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.
The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4452  Respondent: 11074465 / Louise Vaughan  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green. Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
1. POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarns Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.
I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4
way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial
vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the
Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides
Guildford town from visitors until the A3 reaches the A320 Stock Road.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with
paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from
encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these
are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus
shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history
going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before
the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day
during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow,
winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send
and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two
schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham
which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous
cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a
dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it
wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be
uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over
West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around
14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s
requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in
the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow
for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.
Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3355  Respondent: 11097729 / Sheila Brown  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Objections for Policy A25

I object to the proposed wholesale destruction of Green Belt land at Gosden Hill. This must surely be illegal?

I object to the proposal to build 2000 homes at Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow. The infrastructure of the area cannot sustain such a development. Brownfield sites closer to Guildford should be used first. It must make more sense to enlarge a town where facilities already exist, than to erode the countryside which everyone can enjoy.

I object to the 8 Travellers pitches included in this proposal. Eight pitches together would form a separate specialist site. How acceptable would this be to householders nearby owning their own property? Guildford was committed to providing a separate site for all Travellers to their area a number of years ago. What happened to that commitment? [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature]

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2971  Respondent: 11098241 / Sammy Chalk  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7080  Respondent: 11098369 / Neil & Nicki Covington  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
WE OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is gridlocked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/4455</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>Neil &amp; Nicki Covington</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4491  Respondent: 11098977 / Jilly Cooper  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7183  Respondent: 11100193 / Michael Turner  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A25 Gosden HillThere is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.Gosden Hill is located entirely within the green belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below). The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7017  Respondent: 11104033 / David Dutton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the Gosden Farm Hill development (A25) because the strategy for managing traffic to and from this site involves channelling road traffic via the A247 through West Clandon.
I am concerned that more weight should be given to the effect on the existing rural communities, including the local communities of West Clandon, Send and Ripley, with regard to:

1. the effect that increased motor traffic would have on these communities;
2. to the need that any development to existing rural communities should be proportionate to the size and nature of those existing rural communities and should preserve their rural character;
3. the need to maintain the Green Belt; and

West Clandon is a linear village stretching for approximately 3km or 2 miles from the current A3 Burnt Common southbound entrance slip-road, south along the A247 to the traffic lights at the junction with the A25/ A246, just south of West Clandon church. West Clandon has a historic centre with a church, two pubs, a branch of the Royal British Legion, an infant school, an old people's home (Ashley Park), a recreation ground and Clandon Park (a historic National Trust property currently under reconstruction after being damaged by fire). West Clandon has a railway crossed by a hump-backed bridge and a railway station. The southern half of the village is in a conservation area. The village comprises approximately 500 homes.

The A247 through West Clandon, known as “The Street” or at the north end of the village “Clandon Road”, runs right the way through the village. In places it is narrow and winding with significant bends. There is a footpath only on one side and the road is so narrow that it is frequently mounted by lorries. There is a constant stream of broken wing-mirrors left behind as debris evidencing the narrowness of The Street at some sections. Within the last couple of years there has been at least one collision between a vehicle and a building (Summers Barn) at a narrow section. The A247 already has a disproportionate amount of traffic to cope with compared to neighbouring villages because it has a road crossing over (rather than under) the railway line.

Around 100 houses, businesses and amenities have an access directly onto The Street (or Clandon Road). Some of these have very limited visibility (lines of sight) of oncoming traffic in either direction, except through the use of mirrors. The approach road to West Clandon railway station and the Onslow Arms pub are two examples of entrances onto The Street with extremely limited visibility – in the case of the railway station because of the hump-backed bridge, and in the case of The Onslow Arms pub, because the pub building itself is situated on the road and obscures a clear view of traffic approaching from the north. Within the last two weeks there has been a road traffic accident outside The Onslow Arms with one of the vehicles ending up in the garden of Brownlow Cottage opposite the pub. Accidents and near-misses at the junction of Clandon station approach with The Street are extremely common and this is well-known as a dangerous junction with very limited visibility of traffic approaching from the north.

The danger of traffic in West Clandon not only affects vehicles but also pedestrians. The linear nature of the village, plus the fact that the road is only wide enough for a footpath on one side at various points, means that the frequency of passing vehicles can make it difficult for pedestrians to enter and exit some properties at busy times. The same limited visibility from some entrances of traffic on The Street that affects people leaving these properties by vehicle also affects pedestrians. This is particularly difficult for an elderly person or a child. If the volume of traffic increases, the situation will become worse.

The A247 splits the village of West Clandon in half. It divides the church on the west side of The Street from its car park on the east side of The Street. It has to be negotiated by elderly residents of the Ashley Park Care Home, children and parents dropping off or collecting from the Clandon Infant School, users of the two pubs on opposite sides of the road, the railway station, the Recreation Ground and The Royal British Legion.

If there is a higher volume of traffic (at whatever speed), it will be harder to find a gap in the traffic during busy times in order to safely cross The Street. A pedestrian crossing cannot be provided from every house or every business or amenity and there is insufficient room to allow footpaths to be built on both sides of The Street.

Users of several public footpaths crossing The Street, including one on a severe bend near the church, will be put at greater risk. The same is true for pedestrians crossing from the graveyard, Ashley Park old people's home or the church car park, all of which are on the east side of The Street, to the church side of the A247 which has the only pavement at that point.

The number of cyclists that use the A247 as a route to access The North Downs has increased massively following the well publicised use of cycle routes in this area during the Olympics and in national cycle events. The A247 is now a
corridor for cyclists accessing the Downs from Woking and beyond. The winding and narrow nature of the A247 makes it difficult for other vehicles to overtake these cyclists. If the volume of traffic increases then this will only make this problem worse and lead to a higher risk of accidents as more vehicles try to overtake cyclists on narrow winding roads.

Many of the above concerns are specific to West Clandon because it is a linear village divided by the A247 which is narrow, winding and in places bordered by a footpath on only one side. Because it winds through the historic centre of West Clandon there is no possibility of the A247 being widened or of additional footpaths being provided alongside the road, or of improvements to visibility for entrances on to or off The Street. For all of these reasons I consider any significant increase in the volume of traffic on the A247 through West Clandon could have a seriously damaging impact on the quality of life of residents of West Clandon including the approximately 100 homes with entrances directly off The Street/Clandon Road, and on users of West Clandon's railway station, pubs, infant school, church, old people's home, Royal British Legion club, recreation ground and public footpaths.

I am concerned that the provision of 400 homes plus industrial, storage and distribution units at Garlick's Arch just to the north east of West Clandon, an additional entrance and exit to the A3 at Burnt Common, and 2000 homes at Gosden Hill Farm, will produce a much greater volume of traffic on the A247 through West Clandon, particularly at busy times. I OBJECT because I do not believe there has been a proper assessment of the likely impact of these three proposals on the volume of traffic though West Clandon and the effect that this will have on that community, or that any assessment has been properly taken into account. I OBJECT because a key consideration should be the effect on existing neighbouring communities, taking into account the specific circumstances of those communities. A key consideration for Policy 43a (New A3 slip-roads at Send-Marsh/Burnt Common), Policy 43 (Garlick’s Arch) and Policy A25 (Gosden Hill Farm) should be the effect of the increased traffic that these policies and the Plan as a whole will have on the community of West Clandon and neighbouring communities of Ripley and Send.

Additionally the scale of the proposed developments in the vicinity of West Clandon are disproportionate to the size of the existing rural community.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4155  Respondent: 11104033 / David Dutton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Gosden Hill development of 1700 houses. Reference to a potential link road from the development to the A247. The clear implication is for an access from the development to the A247 with enormous traffic implications for the A247.
2. South bound off- and on- slip roads to service the development and replace the existing off- slip road to Burpham. The only North bound access to the A3 will be via the existing slip road off Clay Lane. (See later, Burnt Common).
3. A 4-entry form secondary school, a primary school, a retail centre and a park and ride for up to 700 cars.
4. When developed, the new employment site at the north side of Gosden Hill Farm (site allocation A25) will be treated as an Office and Research & Development Strategic Employment Site (7000sq.m). This could mean several hundred employees.
5. The development of this site will cause massive congestion in surrounding roads. It will generate many thousands of vehicle movements onto the A3 which is already at a crawl every day during peak periods.
6. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. The proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress.
8. The A247 through West Clandon is not suited to cope with additional traffic for reasons including: (i) although notionally an A-road the A247 is narrow and winding in parts and is most unsuited to carrying additional traffic, (ii) the A247 has a single non-continuous footpath in several sections, (iii) a care home, a church car park and a pub, as well as very many houses, are located on the opposite side of the road to the only footpath, making pedestrian access difficult for people moving about the village on foot, especially for elderly and disabled people; (iv) the railway station and other commercial and residential properties have poor sight lines for access onto the A247 and difficulties in accessing the A247 from these properties will be exacerbated by increased traffic volume (and fewer "gaps" between cars); (v) the A247 is popular with cyclists and because of its narrow and winding nature the potential for accidents that additional traffic will cause is clear.

9. The A247 may be an A-road on the map but in reality it is a residential road with numerous bends, narrow sections and side-entrances. The road through West Clandon already has numerous accident black spots, such as: (I) the exit from Clandon station which has extremely poor sight lines due to a humped back bridge where numerous accidents have occurred; (ii) the exit from the Onslow Arms pub which is almost blind due to the pub building being adjacent the road - a vehicle has recently ended up in the garden of the cottage opposite; (iii) the narrow section outside “Summers” which is regularly littered with the wing mirrors of cars which have made contact, as well as being a dangerous area for pedestrians due to vehicles mounting the pavement to try to pass; (iv) the winding section outside Clandon Regis and near the primary school which regularly suffers from demolition of gate posts and fences as vehicles leave the road; (v) the bend near West Clandon church which has seen damage caused to the flint wall in recent years.

10. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too many.

11. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

12. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of Green Belt.

13. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.

14. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

15. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion on surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3. The A3 is at a crawl every day during peak periods, and often at weekends as well. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

16. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress.

17. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

18. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object specifically to proposed building on Gosden Hill Farm on Green Belt designated to prevent West Clandon being absorbed into a sprawling urban environment four times the size of the village it blights;

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3143  Respondent: 11114721 / Elizabeth Wilcockson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

14. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day. Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.
If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km. Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7078  Respondent: 11150913 / Sarah Marshall  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 – 2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital  Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.
The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

   No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

   The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

   Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

   The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

   The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/7777</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong></th>
<th>11832961 / The National Trust - London and SE (Rachel Botcherby)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agent:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Document:</strong></th>
<th>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></th>
<th>( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is one of the largest site allocations proposed in the local plan, seeking deliver approximately 2000 homes, employment floorspace, local retail centre, new schools and community facilities, yet it is located within the greenbelt, includes an area of ancient woodland, and borders a Site of Nature Conservation Importance. The site also closely abuts the edge of the Grade II registered Clandon Park Historic Park and Garden. The importance of the landscape was principally recognised as an eighteenth century landscape park by Lancelot ‘Capability’ Brown, although the subsequent late nineteenth century gardens advised by William Andrews Nesfield are also noted.
Whilst the two sites are physically separated by the railway line, the scale, massing height and layout of the development on this site, including the desire for a new railway station, will need to have due regard to the neighbouring historic landscape and the impact on the setting of this valuable heritage asset.

We would also question the approach and detail of the policy wording given the scale of development envisaged. We are concerned at the limited inclusion of any urban design principles or considerations for such a strategic site allocation.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/5706  **Respondent:** 12039777 / Celia Howells  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am emailing to object to the Local Plan on the following grounds:

Massive loss of green belt - how will that affect us?

Development of Gosden Hill would double the size of Burpham without providing additional infrastructure

Increased traffic from developments without specific improvements to roads

Gosden Hill should not be developed at all until the proposed A3 tunnel plans have been confirmed.

Burpham has already seen a large increase in traffic due to Aldi - there is no capacity for more.

Sewage flooding is a regular problem in Burpham. Another 2200 homes on Gosden Hill will surely make it worse.

GBC has not explained how they reached the numbers for so much increased housing. The plan for Gosden Hill is disproportionate for the area

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4184  **Respondent:** 14177313 / Ian Macpherson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Page 198- Site Allocation A25 Gosden Hill Farm.

Have previously [2016] entered the strongest objections to this development, on the grounds that it will significantly cross criteria in NPPF para 80 and 84, and most significantly para 109 point 1 “valued landscape” - as the view of the North Downs from the A3 is. There does not seem to be a case here for this substantial Green Belt removal and development except housing need, which by itself has not been supported at Enquiry or in the Courts.
As for the amended proposal here, I note it has gained a major employment activity [7000 sq. m.] at the north [the A3 side] of the site, which, prima-facie, would make commercial buildings -as at Woodbridge flyover- the major impact on the view from the A3.

Obj maintained, supplemented by specific obj to ‘employment’ north [ie next to A3 view].

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5666  Respondent: 14188833 / Graham Mills  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Gosden Hill Farm:

This massive proposed development will have a huge impact on Burpham, the proposal is to effectively double the size of Burpham. This is a major assault on a village area on the outskirts of town. Burpham is already congested particularly at peak times, adding to this 2000 houses, a 1000 car park and ride, 2 schools and perhaps a station will add thousands more car movements to an already congested road network. The increase in solution is unacceptable.

Gosden Hill is in the Green Belt, the topography of the hill means it is a very visible site when driving on the A3. Development of these green fields will spread the urban sprawl in a very visible manor significantly up the A3.

A large portion of the traffic from this massive site will head towards Guildford via the roads through Burpham, this is already congested and will simply not cope with the increase, moreover the pollution of near stationary cars will blight the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2211  Respondent: 15084897 / Save Send Action Group (Andrew Procter)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

38   POLICY A25 GOSDEN HILL
38.1  I object to policy A25 Gosden Hill
38.2  There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
38.3  Gosden Hill is located entirely within the green belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
38.4  The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
38.5  The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

38.6  The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

38.7  I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

38.8  The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

38.9  A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2231</th>
<th>Respondent: 15084897 / Save Send Action Group (Andrew Procter)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1 **I object** to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.

1.2 There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

1.3 Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,

1.4 The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity

1.5 The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

1.6 The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
1.7 I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way 
junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on 
the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

1.8 The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two 
schools. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway 
England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/98  Respondent: 15105057 / Phil Wicks  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally 
Compliant? ( )

The proposal to build 2000 homes on the site of Gosden Hill farm is disgraceful. The removal of this green belt land is 
unacceptable, will put a massive strain on an already overworked infrastructure and remove green open land from future 
generations. This site alongside the A3 is totally unsuited to housing development. I will fight the planning decision to 
built on this land and ruin this location to the east of Guildford. This is not a suitable answer to the need for new 
housing. I urge the planners to reconsider this decision and remove this location from the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5516  Respondent: 15138273 / David Latin  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally 
Compliant? ( )

Of particular concern to me and my family is that a more local level the proposals include:

2,000 houses at Gosden Hill Farm (4.2 miles away).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1600  Respondent: 15150817 / Robert Winborn  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally 
Compliant? ( )

5) I OBJECT TO Site A25 Gosden Hill Farm. How can you warrant 2000 homes being built in the Green Belt, massive 
implications to the surrounding area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/342</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15155393 / Heidi Powell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site A25 / Gosden Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to this proposal. I am again concerned about the scale of this development and the pressure it would put on local services (education &amp; health). I also question the impact this number of additional people will place on A3 congestion (North &amp; Southbound).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/1587</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15186753 / Michael Hoyle</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed change from 2000 to min 1700 homes is still too many homes for Burpham and Merrow to handle. Traffic conditions in the area are at gridlock levels now and I cannot see the proposed changes to road infrastructure will do anything to alleviate the daily traffic chaos in and around Burpham/Merrow. Surely the planners must be able to see the impact that the amount of cars that 1700 homes would produce. Please reconsider the number of homes at Gosden Hill and let common sense prevail.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/3410</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15196449 / Fran Jepson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We strongly object to the revised local plan on the basis that the housing numbers required appear to have been calculated out of thin air. There is no transparency in the way the new numbers have been calculated and therefore these should not be used to over populate an already overpopulated borough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The plan for Gosden Farm has been based on building on green belt land. The local plan does not address the need for housing without building on green belt land which I assumed was not acceptable. The additional traffic through Burpham that this will cause is also not acceptable. The building of the supermarket Aldi with access only via Burpham Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
already causes gridlock and not just at peak times. Introducing a minimum of 1700 cars driving through Burpham if this development gets the go ahead is not acceptable. The air pollution of this additional traffic will not be acceptable.

Pushing more traffic through Burpham is not an acceptable alternative as there is insufficient room on the London Road as it stands now. Adding additional housing into an already overpopulated area will mean that Burpham will disappear into an urban sprawl that will undoubtedly please Guildford Borough Council as they have already let several developments spring up where one house has been changed into three houses, already adding more traffic to the overburdened roads.

For the above reasons I strongly object to the local plan that appears to have been made on dubious calculations without thought to local residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/732  Respondent: 15198913 / Diana Gordon  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

5) The wholesale development of 2,000 homes at Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow - Policy A25) in clear contravention of the central government's stated commitment for Green Belt protection.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/582  Respondent: 15207777 / M Henin  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We live in New Inn Lane, Burpham and are extremely concerned about the Proposed Local Plan for Gosden Hill.

There is no evidence supporting the need to build such a high number of extra houses in the area. The scale of the building project is out of proportion compared to previous year figures (693 a year, more than double the previous figure given in 2012 of 322) and out of line with the current political and economic uncertainty which puts people off buying.

The choice of the location of Gosden Hill is also surprising.

Given the lack of any reliable bus routes to Guildford centre, Burpham is not likely to be attractive to working people with no children. The proposed new railway station in Merrow would not help. Commuters who usually travel to London wish to join the fast lines from either Guildford centre or Woking. The incredibly slow trains which run through our currently picturesque villages will not suit busy commuters.

People as always will travel by car. The proposed tunnel would only partly address the traffic problems. The levels of pollution will become alarming. The loss of the green belt will have long-lasting and irreversible consequences for residents' health and well-being.
Should a credible case for new housing be made, it is not clear why Burpham should bear the grunt of all the extra houses.

Already the construction of Aldi has created daily traffic jams at the end of New Inn Lane. Impatient motorists now fail to stop at the pelican crossing in New Inn Lane, endangering pedestrians and especially children walking to school.

The proposed new 4 way junction at Burnt Common will not alleviate Burpham’s traffic problems as has been claimed. The traffic situation, already dire in Burpham will be made far worse and to the detriment of everyone, residents and road users alike.

Finally, the heavily subscribed local schools will not be able to accommodate such an increase in population. It is irresponsible to push such a large scale project forward without having FIRST built new schools (not to mention bus lines, surgeries etc).

In conclusion, the proposed draft local plan, without any evidence for the need for extra houses on such a large scale, proposes to put the health of residents and the safety of our children in jeopardy.

On grounds of health and safety alone at the very least, it should therefore NOT GO AHEAD.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6417  Respondent: 15225281 / Roger Gamlin  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the large proposed development 2,000 houses at Gosden Hill (A25)

It will destroy large areas of Green Belt and agricultural land and produce congestion on the A3 and surrounding roads including Ripley & Send.

Gosden Hill is located entirely within the green belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet the requirements of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/699  Respondent: 15229313 / Caitlin Gordon  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

5) The wholesale development of 2,000 homes at Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow - Policy A25) in clear contravention of the central government's stated commitment for Green Belt protection.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPS16/762  Respondent: 15234849 / Alastair Fleming  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the planned development of 2000 houses at Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow (Policy A25) in clear contravention of the Government's and Conservative councillors' election manifesto promises to protect the Green Belt. I object to the unsustainable nature of the site, the poor air quality and noise pollution levels that will result and the infrastructure deficit that will result.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5155  Respondent: 15238049 / Glenda Charlick  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site A25 Gosden Hill Farm - massive overdevelopment of 2000 homes in the green belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/772  Respondent: 15239297 / T Fleming  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

10. I object to the inclusion of the planned development of 2000 houses at Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow (Policy A25) in clear contravention of the Government's and Conservative councillors' election manifesto promises to protect the Green Belt. I object to the unsustainable nature of the site, the poor air quality and noise pollution levels that will result and the infrastructure deficit that will result.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/945  Respondent: 15254689 / Claire Brougham  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan.

Firstly traffic is already horrendous in the mornings, and afternoons a further 2000 homes would make it impossible to get anywhere.

There are not enough places in local schools for more children.

Loss of green belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/950  Respondent: 15254785 / M.D. Vickers  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.
The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2894  Respondent: 15255521 / Wendy Last  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO THE PLANS OUTLINES IN POLICY A25 This massive development, coupled with POLICY A43, would transform the rural nature of the villages of Send and Ripley to a sprawling suburb of Guildford. Our Green Belt lost forever!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/956  Respondent: 15255553 / J.A. Vickers  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.
No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
1. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two-way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.
Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/968  **Respondent:** 15256833 / C J Vickers  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.
The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1064  **Respondent:** 15263073 / James Walker  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill developement being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow,
winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4626    Respondent: 15263073 / James Walker    Agent:     
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.

2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.

4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.

5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1071  Respondent: 15263905 / Philip Walker  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.
The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4601  Respondent: 15263905 / Philip Walker  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1076  Respondent: 15264001 / Robert Peake  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4606  Respondent: 15264001 / Robert Peake  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon.
development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A45a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The site is on the principal gateway to Guildford and is considered to be of Medium Sensitivity in Green Belt terms; which Miller considers surprising as although the site may not prevent settlements from merging or assist in preserving the historic character of Guildford, it is an extremely prominent site which sits above the datum of the road and is therefore considered important in terms of the ‘openness’ of the Green Belt. The site also lies to the west of an area of significant woodland and to the north of Clandon Park, a registered park and gardens. Combined these factors would suggest the site should be classified as being of High Sensitivity in Green Belt terms and that the use of the ‘four purposes’ alone is unrepresentative of the sites contribution to the Green Belt.

This development will provide for over 2,000 dwellings, a potential 1,000 space Park & Ride site, a two-form primary school, a four-form entry secondary school and employment and community floor space, all of which are high traffic generating uses which means that the allocation is highly dependent upon strategic infrastructure improvements which, as the Council acknowledges, may require the development to be phased in line with infrastructure delivery.

The site is proposed to be served by a new southbound off and south bound on slip to the A3 and improvements to the local network along the A3100. However, the Plan refers also to the potential for a new all movements junction on the A3 which would potentially reduce the net developable area of the site.

Miller considers that with no all movements junction the development could have an unacceptable impact on the local highway network through Burpham; which is already at capacity. Whilst the Plan suggests that development might be phased to allow for major infrastructure improvements to be delivered first, Miller is of the view that no development can realistically take place on this site until the local network has been improved and, if required, the SMC proposals implemented. Lesser levels of mitigation would be unlikely to prove adequate given existing pressures.

In circumstances where the infrastructure improvements are yet to be confirmed it is not known how the developer can assess the cost implications which could place a very significant burden on the viability of the scheme and the timing of delivery. Miller is concerned that these requirements could significantly hinder the Council’s ability to rely on this development being delivered within the plan period or provide the level of affordable housing envisaged (40%) In addition the number of dwellings proposed could reduce if the developable area is reduced due to the requirements of an all movements junction on the A3.

The cumulative effect of a shortfall in housing from this site and the other major allocations further increases the risks associated with relying on these strategic sites.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour onto the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The road through West Clandon is used as a regular route for HGV driver training and many times people have to mount the payment at the pinch points. I myself have burst a tyre having to do this to avoid a driver on the wrong side of the road.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.
Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1295  **Respondent:** 15285345 / Mike Boughton  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The road through West Clandon is used as a regular route for HGV driver training and many times people have to mount the payment at the pinch points.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.
Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1665  Respondent: 15292129 / Shirley Wilson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Site A25 Godsen Hill Farm as it’s a massive overdevelopment of 2000 homes on green belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1314  Respondent: 15295329 / Matt Sage  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We object to the 2016 draft local plan. Living in Burpham gives us great access to the local green belt that we feel will be lost for ever if the proposals for the 6000 homes go ahead in the areas close to us. In particular the closest Gosden Hill's allowance of upto 2000 homes will take the defined edge of Guildford's urban boundary out across the green belt and essentially join the villages of Clandon, Send, horsey and Ripley together over time. This loss of open space around...
Guildford will cause Guildford to lose its identity and space for many to enjoy on foot, bike, horse etc. There appears to be a disproportionate level of development identified for this side of the city.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1330  **Respondent:** 15297313 / Susannah Stemp  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

As a Burpham resident, I object to the 2016 draft local plan. The proposed developments in the Gosden Hill farm area in particular appear to completely disregard the importance of conserving green belt land. The plan proposes a disproportionate level of development in one area of the borough with a complete lack of evidence for the alleged demand for this amount of housing. Similarly, the plan as it stands contains a lack of specific details about essential infrastructure, especially as there is already a recognised existing deficit.

We have lived in Guildford for a long time and hope to raise our children in the village of Burpham, however if implemented in its current form, this plan will make Burpham unrecognisable from how it is today. I find it very disappointing that this proposal has the potential to significantly change the locality, yet has been put forward with minimal time for consultation with the people who live and work locally to contribute their view.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1338  **Respondent:** 15298017 / Margaret Cousins  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.
The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

We object to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds we believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement (see also below).

We object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon-a road which is already under traffic stress (see also below).

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

1. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.
Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4408  **Respondent:** 15300385 / Mark Harding  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1391  Respondent: 15303649 / Maureen Wilkins  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

2. Gosden Hill Farm Development

I strongly disagree with the Gosden Hill Farm development.

The proposal of 2,000 houses for Gosden Hill Farm is outrageous. It will increase local traffic to such an extent that there will be considerable strain on the infrastructure of Burpham and surrounding areas.

Flooding  As we were personally flooded in December 2013 (insurance claim £80,000), the source being the Merrow Lane culvert, we are extremely concerned that all this building on Gosden Hill Farm is going to affect the drainage of the site - which is grass at the moment and will be mainly concrete when it is built on. This will add to flooding risk, not only to the houses around us but to other parts of Burpham.

Sewage  We are concerned about sewage for this site. Many parts of Burpham are under threat from Sewage spillage after heavy rain. Therefore, this must be one of the main considerations before anything is built on Gosden Hill Farm. New houses were allowed to be built in the New Inn Lane area and have made the problem much worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1396  Respondent: 15304897 / Richard Baker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.
No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Glandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Glandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of WEI Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data: 2010 -2014 from Crashmap data

- Glandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents 2015
- 21 Oct 2015 - P2.47 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays

Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street - P2.47 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Glandon London bound between P2.47 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Glandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the P2.47 through West Glandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Glandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.
No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with
deparagraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from
encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these
are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus
shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history
going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before
the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day
during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow,
windy road through West Glandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through
Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two
schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham
which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham's sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous
cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a
dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it
wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Glandon is so small that it is highly likely to be
uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over
West Glandon towards East Glandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around
14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England's
requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an 'aspiration' in
the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow
for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Glandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been
carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and
safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I object to the fact that electricity pylons traverse the site at Garlick’s Arch and Gosden Farm.

“A UK study of 29 000 cases of childhood cancer, including 9700 cases of leukemia, found a raised risk of childhood leukemia in children who lived within 200 m of high voltage lines at birth compared with those who lived beyond 600m (relative risk 1.7)

There was also a slightly increased risk for those living 200-600 m from the lines at birth (relative risk 1.2, P for trend < 0.01); as this is further than can readily be explained by magnetic fields it may be due to other etiological factors associated with power lines.”


I wish these objections to be fully taken into consideration and that the Plan is amended accordingly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to the 2016 Draft local plan in particular how it will affect the residents of Burpham with the Gosden Hill Farm development.

Here are my thoughts:

Why is G.B.C not objecting to the numbers of houses expected to be built by central government as other local areas have done.

The planned development on Gosden Hill farm will double the number of houses already in the whole of Burpham.

The traffic is already at a standstill served time a day in Burpham without all the extra traffic problems around Guildford and how to solve them.

There has been insufficient thought given to issues of road infrastructure, schools, doctors and the extra input on the already overstretched Royal Surrey Hospital.

I also object to this being built on Green Belt and it will take away the buffer between us and neighbouring villages. This is a loss of the countryside which you promised to protect.

Can the utilities, drainage, water, electricity etc be sustained on such a large development.

Overall this plan has not been thought out thoroughly and I completely reject it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSLPS16/1489</td>
<td>15326369 / J D W Todd</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I OBJECT</strong></td>
<td>Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosden Hill Farm Merrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is clear contravention of central government policy of stated commitment for Green Belt Protection. The effect on local amenities would be catastrophic as regards local hospitals, schools, traffic and the environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSLPS16/1540</td>
<td>15329537 / J Sweby</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I object to the vast number of houses proposed on Gosden Farm.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSLPS16/1546</td>
<td>15330945 / Richard Hart</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>As I live close to the Gosden Hill Farm proposals, I am very concerned about the increased traffic movement through Burpham, especially the large Park and Ride area at the proposed new roundabout with only access off and onto the A3 south carriageway. Surely this junction should now be a 4 way route to the South as well as a route North to take vehicles away from Guildford's Ladymead road and London Road Burpham.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSLPS16/1556</td>
<td>15340929 / Claire Smylie</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the Doomsday Book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever they want.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.
Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4707  Respondent: 15340929 / Claire Smylie  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2885  Respondent: 15342401 / M.J. Harris  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve: It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, 82215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham's sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.
The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England's requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an "aspiration" in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1751  Respondent: 15348033 / Peter Nicholas  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the development of the Gosden Hill site as proposed in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Green Belt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the slip road to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land, all requirements of the NPPF.
The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion with West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices, factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is already stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill developement being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.
Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1090  Respondent: 15349281 / Steve Aptel  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.
The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1852  **Respondent:** 15351617 / Patricia George  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. You have not provided a clear and structured plan of how and when you propose to deal with the sewage from the new Gosden Hill houses.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1858  **Respondent:** 15351873 / Magaret Winborn  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO site A25, Gosden Hill Farm. How can you warrant 2000 homes being built on the Green Belt, it will cause massive implications to the surrounding area.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1886</th>
<th>Respondent: 15353633 / Neal Stone</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I OBJECT to Policy A25: Gosden Hill Farm, which is massively out of proportion and will add tremendous burden onto all local services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1887</th>
<th>Respondent: 15353825 / Terry Madgwick</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having been briefed on the inadequacy of detailed thoroughfares, surely as was the case with the Slyfield development plans, commitment to remedying the wholly inadequate stretch of the A3 around Guildford must precede any decisions about Gosden Hill development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1932</th>
<th>Respondent: 15356385 / Mervyn Plumtree</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to site A25 Gosden Hill Farm- massive over development of 2000 homes in the green belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1950</th>
<th>Respondent: 15356801 / Clare Harlow</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
### Comment ID: PSLPS16/1970  
**Respondent:** 15357761 / Ross Haimes  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**Safety**

The increased congestion and low speed cars for prolonged periods throughout the day will lead to very high levels of pollution in the local area. I am very concerned for my two young sons heath due to the proposed development at Gosden Hill Farm. From Winterhill Way there is no safe crossing point across this A3100 which is required to reach Burpham Sainsburys or Burpham Primary School. This is already a busy road and the proposed development will add 5,000+ additional cars to this section. I am concerned about the safety implications to my two young sons due to the proposed development at Gosden Hill Farm.

**Infrastructure**

The proposed development at Gosden Hill Farm will add significant strain on the local infrastructure. The sewage, water and power networks are currently strained for the local population and therefore significant improvements are required to be implemented before even considering building any more houses in the local area. There is not sufficient details in the local plan regarding essential infrastructure improvements and as such the Local Plan should be considered unsound.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

### Comment ID: pslp172/2802  
**Respondent:** 15366721 / Sylvia Newton  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A25 I object. I do strongly object to every single one of these proposals on the grounds of their severe and [illegible word] envorionmental impact.

Especially to the slip roads to the A3 at Burnt Common causing increased traffic pollution and unjustified sacrifice of GREEN BELT land, and historic woodland.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

### Comment ID: PSLPS16/2130  
**Respondent:** 15367361 / Greg Ganjou  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. **POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm**

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.
The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 – 2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Hightcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015


2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.
Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2141  Respondent: 15368129 / Sharon Cork  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015


2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.
The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) is Sound? ( ) is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 June 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital  Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.
No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green. Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 – 2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.
The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2185    Respondent: 15371489 / Vivian E. Thomas CBE    Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object specifically to proposed building on Gosden Hill Farm on the Green Belt designated to prevent West Clandon being absorbed into a sprawling urban environment four times the size of the village it blights;

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. **POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm**

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

**2010 –2014 from Crashmap data**

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

**2015**

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays

  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

**2016**

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4742  Respondent: 15379969 / Teresa Britton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

C.i. Policy 25 Gosden Hill – My Objections

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.

2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.

4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity

5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2262  Respondent: 15381089 / Tim Poyntz  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 – 2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents 2015
- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays Surrey Fire and Rescue deploy

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.
Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2265  Respondent: 15381249 / Helen Poyntz  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
20. POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from
encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
4. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.
Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2325  Respondent: 15385281 / Daniel Tarrant  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A25 Gosden Hill Farm, 2,000 houses, on Green Belt Land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2345  Respondent: 15386017 / Gareth Sinnett  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

20. POLICY A25 Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data: 2010 –2014 from Crashmap data
• Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head 17 incidents
• Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way 8 incidents
• Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane 15 incidents
• Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close 8 incidents 2015
• 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage Three vehicles collided causing delays Surrey Fire and Rescue

2016

• 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
• 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
• 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the offslip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 8789 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is gridlocked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.
The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new onslip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the onslip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cashflow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4356  Respondent: 15386017 / Gareth Sinnett  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2353  **Respondent:** 15386337 / Edna Slater  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

---

1. **POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm**

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

**2010 –2014 from Crashmap data**

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

**2015**

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays

Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

**2016**

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
• 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital  Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.
A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2361  **Respondent:** 15388673 / Bruce Stewart  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. **POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm**

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010–2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015
21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
   Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions

28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham

30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.
The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/4421</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15388673 / Bruce Stewart</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2393  Respondent: 15388737 / Elizabeth Sharman  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the wholesale destruction of the Green Belt in this area, including the planned development of 2000 homes at Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow (Policy A25) in clear contravention of the central government's stated commitment for Green Belt protection.

I look forward to hearing your response on the issues raised in this letter.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2398  Respondent: 15389697 / Oliver Stewart  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010–2014 from Crashmap data
• Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
• Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
• Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
• Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

• 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

• 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
• 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
• 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.
Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2414  Respondent: 15390401 / William Stewart  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.
The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

 Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham's sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England's requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an "aspiration" in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A25 Gosden Hill Farm, 2,000 houses, on Green Belt Land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2465  Respondent: 15398657 / Kim Roberts  Agent:  

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

20. POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data: 2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents 2015
- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays

Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed. 2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane

Burpham

- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road
Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.
A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4725  Respondent: 15398657 / Kim Roberts  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2475  Respondent: 15399041 / Sue Ely  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Gosden Hill development being in the Local

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham's sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost. How is this going to be funded?

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. How is this going to be addressed?

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development. The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England's requirement of 2km.
Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an "aspiration" in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2524  Respondent: 15400961 / Joan Plumtree  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site A25 Gosden Hill Farm - massive over development of 2000 homes in the green belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2552  Respondent: 15405857 / Raymond Mackay  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:
2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.
There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2559  Respondent: 15406017 / Eleanor Roberts  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.
The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 – 2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2568</th>
<th>Respondent: 15406529 / David I Allan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm**

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.
It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.
The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.
The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 -2014 from Crashmap data
- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015
- 21 Oct 2015 - A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays Surrey Fire and Rescue

2016
- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street - A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.
The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham's sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England's requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an "aspiration" in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2740  **Respondent:** 15422145 / Orlando Lee  **Agent:**
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.
Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7585  Respondent: 15422145 / Orlando Lee  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.
The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2748  Respondent: 15422529 / David Roberts  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeated one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data
• Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
• Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
• Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
• Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

• 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

• 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
• 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10
  (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
• 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon,
however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as
congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4
way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial
vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the
Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides
Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with
paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from
encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these
are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus
shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history
going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before
the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day
during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow,
winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send
and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two
schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham
which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous
cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.
Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2790   Respondent: 15424865 / Robert Victor Ewen   Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan The land in Gosden Hill currently does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon and other villages and gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. These are all requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of the Gosden Hill development is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

While no connection is currently shown between Gosden Hill and A247 (save an already overloaded A3) the developer will almost certainly seek to introduce such a connection and bring major new traffic into the village and the problematic A247.
Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an aspirational A3 tunnel to bypass Guildford. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will add to the burden on to the A3 which is already stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100 through Burpham, B2215 through Ripley and A247 through West Clandon would channel thousands of cars, delivery vehicles and construction vehicles through the narrow, winding (A247) road through West Clandon. This is already a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day.

The enhanced volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Without major as yet unplanned modifications, the existing two way north facing junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day. There is no south facing slip and traffic would needs pass through Merrow and Ladymead to access the A3 / A31 southbound. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England's requirement of 2km.

Burpham's sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost. There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a major infrastructure development.

A proposed railway station was previously rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London. This has not changed but we are more dependent than ever on motor cars to access the station.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are all developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36% of demand, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

Development and improvement of the A3 is not even slated to start until after 2020. The building of a tunnel, which is only an "aspiration" in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill and may have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
We object to Policy A25 Gosden Hill Farm, in that even though housing numbers at this site on the surface seem to have been revised slightly downward to 1700 from 2000, in actual fact the wording in Policy A25 now states ‘Approximately 2,000 homes of which a minimum of 1,700 homes will be delivered within the plan period’. This seems to be attempting to indicate a change which in reality may not exist, and is misleading.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2819  Respondent: 15426305 / I C Dean  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I object to Policy A25 Gosden Hill Farm.

1. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating the parish of West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce, defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and the houses along The Street in West Clandon (owned by the same developer as Gosden Hill Farm) will come under enormous pressure.

1. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch, give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

1. The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

1. I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon-a road which Surrey County Council says cannot be improved. This road is already very heavily used at peak times and when the A3 suffers problems it is unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, a primary school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. The addition of the development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians including children walking to and from the school.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2988  Respondent: 15426305 / I C Dean  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Policy A25 – Objections

1. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of the green belt.

2. If this development proceeds, it leaves a narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and West Clandon. The same developer who is promoting Gosden Hill has several times tried to develop this land for housing. The current policy on treating green belt land as a developable resource means that it is only a matter of time before the village is joined up with the urban area.

3. The development will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford.

4. Together with the developments at Garlick’s Arch and Burnt Common there will be an almost uninterrupted ribbon of development along the A3 extending 5 miles from the centre of Guildford.

5. The development of this site will cause massive congestion in surrounding roads. It will generate many thousands of vehicle movements onto the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel large amounts of traffic onto the narrow, winding road through West Clandon and Send.

6. The proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to a 4 way junction at Burnt Common has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon and Send - a road which is already under traffic stress.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2818  Respondent: 15426369 / Harvey West  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to Policy A25, Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2847  Respondent: 15426657 / Jean Birkby  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2846  Respondent: 15426721 / S Mayersbeth  Agent:
I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2855  **Respondent:** 15427617 / Ken Scotland  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

20. **POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm**

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data: 2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents 2015
- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near Shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays Surrey Fire and Rescue

**2016**

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Send Marsh Road - Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and Surrey County Council (SCC) is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.
I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Green Belt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the Doomsday Book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.
Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2854  Respondent: 15427745 / Barry Nelson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The proposed development of Gosden Hill Farm would have a massive impact on Burpham. It would put thousands more vehicles in the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2881  Respondent: 15428225 / Vian Lee  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2887  **Respondent:** 15429025 / Hilary Garside  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I would like to object strongly about the proposed housing planned for Gosden Hill Farm. These are the reasons:

- My main concern is traffic and the inevitable exacerbation of an already congested area. New Inn Lane and Park Road are already at breaking point plus the junctions at London Road and Epsom Road. People going to work and children going to school will be seriously inconvenienced by more traffic. And remember these days each home has at least 2 cars!
- Local parking: will the plan provide more parking spaces for the Burpham Parade? Epsom Road in Merrow? BP Garage / M&S in Merrow? Sainsbury's? Aldi? - I think not! It will make life around here so much more stressful and unpleasant.
- Has the water table and sewage disposal been properly researched? Again I suspect not.
• Having traveller sites included will cause social tension and [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered contrary to the Council’s duty under the Equalities Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected characteristic; and to foster good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it]

Please acknowledge my concerns and add my name to the objectors list

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7369  Respondent: 15430049 / Michael Armstrong  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Gosden Hill site at Clandon/Burpham with 2,200 homes will result in even worse traffic congestion at the A3, the traffic jam which occurs every day and regularly to Burnt Common will extend to Cobham and cause even further congestion at the M25 intersection. The regular traffic chaos which we encounter will be exacerbated.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2969  Respondent: 15430369 / Sarah Long  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2970  Respondent: 15430433 / Simon Greenhill  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2972</th>
<th>Respondent: 15430497 / Martin Chalk</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2921</th>
<th>Respondent: 15430753 / Nick Wright</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Draft Plan is flawed because your proposed development of 2000 homes, offices and industrial sites, a park and ride with provision for 1000 cars, two schools and a railway station will just not physically fit onto Gosden Hill Farm.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2979</th>
<th>Respondent: 15432577 / J Morris</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Object strongly to any development built on GREEN BELT At Gosden Hill Farm</td>
<td><strong>Local plan draft is unsound:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flawed Guildford Borough Council data was used to overestimate housing figures,</td>
<td><strong>The SHMA figure of 693 pa is TOO HIGH</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SHMA figure of 693 pa is TOO HIGH</td>
<td><strong>It has doubled from the figure given 4 years ago when the Brexit vote had not happened. It needs to be reduced in light of the reduced immigration in the future</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It failed to correct historical errors, errors in student needs and errors in estimated homes needed to support job growth. Therefore the GBC needs to reduce this housing needs figure now after BREXIT. Instead they have refused to release their calculations. The report is unaccountable and therefore THE LOCAL PLAN MUST BE CONSIDERED UNSOUND.</td>
<td><strong>An independent report commissioned by the guildford residents assoc, put the pre Brexit number at only 510 per year. This is also reducable in light of less immigration to Britain now we are out of EU.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of development of homes during the Plan period at 14000</td>
<td><strong>The number of development of homes during the Plan period at 14000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
is based on flawed and pre-Brexit data and is in any case unsustainable. It would result in massive overdevelopment. The destruction of the precious natural environment to disproportionately expand Burpham, with no constraints on the plan to protect the rural nature of the village would result in total loss of Send, Ripley, Wisley and Burpham's unique village identities.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2980  Respondent: 15432609 / Emma Archard  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan as I believe it will make Burpham a less enjoyable and safe place to live for current residents. 2000 extra homes at Gosden Hill seems too large a number for the local infrastructure to accommodate. The traffic problems in this area are already severe and would become extreme with the addition of up to 4000 extra cars. The pressure on local schools would certainly affect children already living in this area and the loss of the Green Belt is an unacceptable prospect for those of us who respect the beauty and sanctity of this area.

If no firm plans are in place for a tunnel then plans to redevelop Gosden Hill need to wait until this is resolved, and in order to avoid overloading this currently pleasant area, a smaller development could perhaps be considered by planners.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3014  Respondent: 15433633 / Mike Allcock  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A25 GOSDEN HILL.FARM

Transport and environmental issues would delay development. In particular:

- New juncture on A3 - expensive / disruptive / long lead time
- Provision of new railway station - expensive / very long lead time
- Other infrastructure issues - expensive / disruptive / long lead time
- There are flooding issues / draining issues
- Boundaries require sensitive design and are not consistent with government policy of ensuring that any boundary changes to the green belt will have a degree of permanency
- There are tree preservation Orders in place

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3043  Respondent: 15433793 / Jennifer Morris  Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Councils housing estimate needs are flawed and should be massively reduced in the way Woking and Waverley council has applied constraints to overall Housing growth.

Especially in light of Brexit the figures for housing needs now need to be recalculated before this unneccessary development of 2000 houses at Gosden Hill goes ahead , destroying the GREEN BELT. The local peoples desire or the communities neccessity for a low income and traveller site estate on the Green Belt is absolutely zero.

The National Planning policy Framework states that:

The essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.

The Local Plan does NOT give sufficient evidence of exceptional circumstances to justify allocating Green Belt land at Gosden Hill, an ancient forest with massive importance to conservation of wildlife, and local residents and future generations pollution, noise and quality of environment for unecessary development.

Instead more consideration can be given to brownfield regeneration, homes in the town centre instead of retail which is becoming less needed as internet shopping takes over for most people. More Student housing can be built on campus, it is not needed out in the countryside many miles from the University.

The proposed 2000 houses dumped on Gosden Hill would have a devastating effect on Burpham and must be thrown out. A Park and Ride for 1000 cars, 2 schools - unfunded by govt plans, and a train station also not planned for in Wessex railway plans are going to put un atrocious level of congestion and pollution all on the area of Burpham. Clay Lane is proposed in the plan as the only way for 3000 cars from Gosden Hill Site to access the A3 northbound. Putting this level of traffic through Burphams already busy centre would be fundamentally flawed and the only solution would be a 4 way intersection at Potters Lane A3.

This, along with the Tunnel to ease traffic congestion in Guildford are not on the plan.

A decision on the tunnel is needed before Gosden Hill can be earmarked for housing development.

The council used flawed data, an unsatisfactory consultation period, and lack of evidence for alleged housing needs in the future therefore the local plan is UNSOUND and must be refused.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3068  Respondent: 15434817 / Peta Hayden  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I very strongly object to the Draft Local Plan June 2016

It is unsound for many reasons but the main objection I have is to the inclusion a travellers site on Green Belt Land at Gosden Hill Farm.

The infrastructure provision for building 2000 houses here is clearly unsustainable and would ruin the village of Burpham, as well as destroying the unique and important separate identities of the villages surrounding the area, West Clandon, Send and Ripley.

[Response has been redacted due to statements being considered contrary to the Council’s duty under the Equalities Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected characteristic; and to foster
good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

[Summary of redacted paragraph: Objection to the proposal for 9 traveller pitches at Gosden Hill Farm on the basis that: it would be detrimental to the area; Burpham is already an attractive area for the gypsy traveller community without the provision of further sites; and the proposal has the potential to increase tension between the traveller and non-traveller community which would result in social, economic and environmental impacts, as seen at other traveller sites in in Egerton Road, Bannisters Field, Worpleson, Compton and Woking.]

The 30% rise in transport polluting Burpham were the Draft Local Plan to bring about the unneccessary development of Green Belt at Gosden Hill Farm would seem like nothing compared to the actual rubbish tip the travellers would no doubt dump in our gardens ,roadsides ,green spaces and hedges. The Common Land along Merrow Lane and the beautiful ancient woodland adjacent to the proposed traveller site would quickly and irrevocably be damaged, polluted and become a rubbish tip.

If Guildford Borough Council were to allow this plan to develop Gosden Hill Low income housing estates on Green Belt countryside they would be diminishing the property values of local homeowners, and quality of life of all the residents of Burpham, West Clandon and Merrow to hell. Policy requiring local authorities to plan to meet the housing needs of gypsies and travellers should be axed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6364  Respondent: 15434817 / Peta Hayden  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

No exceptional circumstances to allow Unneccessary Development have been shown by Borough Council to warrant the 200 house and traveller sites being built on Gosden Hill Farm

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2354  Respondent: 15437601 / Robert Legg  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I Have 3 points to make

1) There is already frequent congestion on the A3 and A3100 which run through Guildford and lead to gridlock in Burpham and cause high pollution levels on a frequent basis. Guildford Council have conveniently overlooked this and have provided no information as to current levels and the impact of pollution of up to 2000 more properties at Gosden Hill Farm.

2) The Local Plan should include improvements to busses & public transport so cars are less essential. By this I mean more than just a Park and Ride included in the Gosden Hill development.

3) There is no certain reference to Guildford being in the Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Metropolitan Green Belt and how Guildford Council respect and plan to maintain these.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3157</th>
<th>Respondent: 15440161 / Linda Daniell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to policy A25 Gosden Hill and the development of 2000 houses, travellers pitches etc. The new proposed junction for the A3 to facilitate the development and the increased traffic would be excessive. Traffic through Send in both directions comes regularly to a standstill at this present time. It will be gridlocked, particularly in bad weather, if the proposed housing with its accompanying traffic goes ahead. I stress the impact it will have on services including doctors and hospitals. The Royal Surrey A and E Dept struggles to cope at the moment. By increasing the weight of traffic on the A3 and the population around Guildford in general there will be dangerous implications for the lives of people. Without putting into place a huge increase in capacity of our NHS facilities before building thousands of new homes, the borough is being grossly negligent. A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3166</th>
<th>Respondent: 15440513 / Alexandra Gordon</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The wholesale development of 2,000 homes at Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow - Policy A25) in clear contravention of the central government's stated commitment for Green Belt protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3168</th>
<th>Respondent: 15440545 / Susan Wright</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosden Hill Farm is in the Green Belt and as such you need to be able to show that there are 'exceptional circumstances to justify allocating green belt land for strategic development' and this you have not done. Any development on Gosden Hill Farm will add thousands of additional vehicles onto an already over congested road system and your proposed solution is totally inadequate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital  Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.
I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4-way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.
Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4686  Respondent:  15442049 / Ellouise Fassom  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3207  Respondent:  15442081 / Lauren Fassom  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.
The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.
The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I wish to object to the 2016 draft local plan. I am a resident of New Inn Lane, Burpham, and believe the proposed Gosden Hill Farm development will have a significant adverse impact on the local area. My specific concerns are:

1. Road infrastructure is not sufficient to cope with the traffic that will result from the proposals. The roundabout outside the new Aldi store has demonstrated this point with the congestion caused on London Road and New Inn Lane from only a small increase in traffic volume, relative to that which will result from the proposals.
2. During the groundwork and construction phases of the development, the level of disruption within the area will be significant, with the roads becoming clogged as a result of deliveries, plant, and so forth. Pedestrian safety will be put at risk as roads are not designed to cope with such intensive usage.
3. Southbound traffic on the A3 is crawling most weekday evenings and the proposed development will only serve to increase these problems. The same is true for introducing junctions allowing southbound traffic to join and northbound traffic to exit the A3.
4. The development will ruin the dynamic of the local area, which currently provides for a friendly, village community, yet with all the amenities and transport links as a result of the close proximity with Guildford. This will be lost with the proposed urbanisation of the area.
5. The details concerning the proposal are extremely limited at this stage and residents have not been afforded sufficient information or time to fully consider the impact to the local area. For example:
6. There is no evidence to support that there is sufficient demand for the level of housing proposed. A significant oversupply of houses, which seems highly possible, would lead to instability in the local housing market.
7. There is no evidence to support the need for the proposed employment and retail provisions. Again, an under or over supply could affect the viability of the development.
8. It is unclear the purpose for the park & ride and new railway station. The railway station serves no purpose, being as close as it would be to both London Road and Clandon stations. The station would serve stopping services to London so would be of no benefit to a large proportion of commuters.
9. [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered contrary to the Council’s duty under the Equalities Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected characteristic; and to foster good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it]
10. There appears to be little consideration of green space and public open spaces, despite considering the proposed development will result in the loss of a substantial proportion of green belt land in the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3247</th>
<th>Respondent: 15442913 / Inger Scotland</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ()</td>
<td>is Sound? ()</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant? ()</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 – 2014 from Crashmap data:

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcots Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near Shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays Surrey Fire and Rescue

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Send Marsh Road - Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and Surrey County Council (SCC) is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Green Belt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the Doomsday Book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.
The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3276  Respondent: 15445793 / Jackie Withers  Agent:  

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from
Encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Comment ID: PSLPS16/5524  Respondent: 15448289 / Paul Miller  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3344  Respondent: 15448321 / Nicole Mapplebeck  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.
If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4661  Respondent: 15448321 / Nicole Mapplebeck  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.
No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices_factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010–2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  - Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.
No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.
The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/8240  **Respondent:** 15450817 / Audrey Gachen  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object particularly to the proposed development at Garlick’s Arch and Gosden Hill Farm. The developments are out of proportion to the surrounding area and do not qualify for exceptional circumstances required to take them out of the Green Belt. In addition, I object to the planning policies as follows.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land: all requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.
Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3505  Respondent: 15451905 / Jonathan Withers  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.
The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3510  **Respondent:** 15451969 / Rosie Lee  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow.
winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants .

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/3684</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15454465 / Marissa Draper</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td>1. I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally an inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3685</th>
<th>Respondent: 15454497 / Rick Parker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally an inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3686</th>
<th>Respondent: 15454529 / Janet Tarbet</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally an inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3689</th>
<th>Respondent: 15454561 / Charles Dadswell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally an inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3690</th>
<th>Respondent: 15454593 / Jack Dadswell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally an inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally an inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
1. I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally an inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3695  
**Respondent:** 15454881 / Mark Fielder  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally an inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3696  
**Respondent:** 15454913 / A Burston  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally an inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3697  
**Respondent:** 15454945 / Claire Cassar  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally an inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3698  
**Respondent:** 15455009 / Emma Graham  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3699</th>
<th>Respondent: 15455073 / Amanda Fletcher</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally an inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3700</th>
<th>Respondent: 15455105 / Kate Robinson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally an inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3688</th>
<th>Respondent: 15455201 / Edith Dadswell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally an inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment ID: PSLPS16/8239  Respondent: 15456353 / Peter Farrant  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan to build 2000 homes in Gosden Hill Farm and a further 4000 close to Burpham.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3738  Respondent: 15458081 / K C Meldrum  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A25- I object to this policy as it is unsound and is not positively prepared. The proposals for the development of Gosden Hill Farm would make traffic movements in Burpham quite horrendous and doesn’t take into account land that should be reserved for a tunnel. This will have a significant knock on effect in Merrow.

Provision must be made for 4 way access to the A3 and not for the 2 way access proposed.

I do not support a new railway station in Merrow unless there is a new footbridge over the railway line and the bridge under the railway line is re-built.

The common land in Merrow Lane must be protected and must not become an access for any development on Gosden Hill Farm

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6453  Respondent: 15458081 / K C Meldrum  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the proposal for development of Gosden Hill Farm that will cause traffic chaos in Merrow and Burpham and should be withdrawn- not least because the infrastructure is still no more than an aspiration.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7888  Respondent: 15460737 / Donna Collinson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
See comments on questions 1 to 3

Policy on green approaches needs strengthening

Land for A3 tunnel entrance and works areas needs safeguarding

See Appendix 4

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3866</th>
<th>Respondent: 15462241 / V.S. Thomas</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object specifically to proposed building on Gosden Hill Farm on the Green Belt designated to prevent West Clandon being absorbed into a sprawling urban environment four times the size of the village it blights;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3890</th>
<th>Respondent: 15462785 / Thomas McMinn</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object specifically to proposed building on Gosden Hill Farm on the Green Belt designated to prevent West Clandon being absorbed into a sprawling urban environment four times the size of the village it blights;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**14. I OBJECT** to Gosden Hill development being in the Local The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land: all requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.
The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3928</th>
<th>Respondent: 15464673 / Trudy Grey</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.
It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data: 2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents 2015
- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays Surrey Fire and Rescue

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane

Burpham

- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow,
winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham's sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development. The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
20. POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data: 2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents 2015
- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays

Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed. 2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.
The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day. Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London. The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km. Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4032  Respondent: 15469249 / Daniel Harris  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.
Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4068  Respondent: 15470145 / Linda Eyre  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore It does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100,82215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day. Burpham's sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing a project of enormous cost. There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development. The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London. The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%,5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.
A new on-slip at Burpham would only be .5km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England's requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an "aspiration" in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4077  **Respondent:** 15472097 / Bernard Eyre  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?**

( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, 82215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham's sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.
Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%,5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be .5km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England's requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an "aspiration" in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4152  **Respondent:** 15474849 / Timothy Yorath  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Glandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green remaining between Guildford and Glandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Glandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.
Note the following accident data: 2010 -2014 from Crashmap data

- Glandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015


2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street - A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Glandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane, (Bumtcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airtlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road. Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, 82215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools. Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day. Burpham's sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost. There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development. The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London. The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants. The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development. A new
on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England's requirement of 2km. Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an "aspiration" in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Glandon and the A3. Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4774  Respondent: 15474849 / Timothy Yorath  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4154  Respondent: 15475297 / Jane Patricia Chandler  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.
Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4217  **Respondent:** 15477665 / S.J. Wilkins  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

4, Gosden Hill Farm Development

I strongly object to the proposed development at Gosden Hill Farm, it should not be built on the Green Belt. The development of 2,000 houses will very much increase the local traffic and put a considerable strain on the infrastructure of Burpham.

Flooding with regards to the Gosden Hill Farm Development-It would appear from the proposed plan that the Merrow Stream will flow through a part of Gosden Hill Farm development. This stream seriously flooded 2 houses during the floods of December 2013 (one to an insurance claim of £80,000). A considerable amount of surface water flowed down from Merrow Park Estate, as it does during heavy rainfall. This swells the Merrow Common Stream and results in flooding around Merrow Lane Bridge and culverts in the Merrow Common Stream. The developers of Merrow Park should have built a holding lake for the estate but this was never done. Consequently, the surface water follows a downward path to the culvert in Merrow Lane. Again, the building of Gosden Hill Farm will cause the drainage water to flow into the stream and increase the possibility of flooding.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4229  **Respondent:** 15478177 / Michelle Brown  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.
The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 – 2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7086</th>
<th>Respondent: 15478209 / Sally Daboo</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010–2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10
  (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 June 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see above and below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained. To allow this would be plain irresponsible.
The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2024   Respondent: 15478209 / Sally Daboo   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Gosden Hill development of 1,700 houses. Reference to a potential link road from the development to the A247. The clear implication is for an access from the development to the A247 with enormous traffic implications for the A247.

South bound off- and on- slip roads to service the development and replace the existing off- slip road to Burpham. The only North bound access to the A3 will be via the existing slip road off Clay Lane. (See later, Burnt Common).

A 4-entry form secondary school, a primary school, a retail centre and a park and ride for up to 700 cars.
When developed, the new employment site at the north side of Gosden Hill Farm (site allocation A25) will be treated as an Office and Research & Development Strategic Employment Site (7,000sq.m). This could mean several hundred employees.

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1,700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4699  Respondent: 15479681 / George Smith  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the GreenBelt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5633  Respondent: 15479681 / George Smith  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the GreenBelt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4307  Respondent: 15481409 / Amy F Corstin  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays

Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road
Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.
Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4389  **Respondent:** 15482817 / C.E. Pullen  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham's sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.
The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England's requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an "aspiration" in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4388  Respondent: 15483009 / S Acomb  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow,
winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon Burpham, Merrow and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4470</th>
<th>Respondent: 15483713 / Claire Walker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4425  Respondent: 15484097 / Chris Preece  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Gosden Hill Farm:

This massive proposed development will have a huge impact on Burpham, the proposal is to effectively double the size of Burpham. This is a major assault on a village area on the outskirts of town. Burpham is already congested particularly at peak times, adding to this 2000 houses, a 1000 car park and ride, 2 schools and perhaps a station will add thousands more car movements to an already congested road network. The increase in solution is unacceptable.

Gosden Hill is in the Green Belt, the topography of the hill means it is a very visible site when driving on the A3. Development of these green fields will spread the urban sprawl in a very visible manor significantly up the A3.

A large portion of the traffic from this massive site will head towards Guildford via the roads through Burpham, this is already congested and will simply not cope with the increase, moreover the pollution of near stationary cars will blight the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4460  Respondent: 15485601 / Tim Jewers  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I object to A25 Gosden Hill Farm site of over 2000 homes, this is a huge over development in Green Belt and will cause congestion on the trunk roads A3 / M25.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4497  Respondent: 15486081 / Rosie Ainsworth  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4508  Respondent: 15486177 / Daniel Peyton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4518  Respondent: 15486305 / Noel Ainsworth  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4535  Respondent: 15486849 / Eric Waestaff  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4713</th>
<th>Respondent: 15486881 / Mark Langton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4714</th>
<th>Respondent: 15486913 / Sarah Langton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4712</th>
<th>Respondent: 15486945 / J Hazelton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment ID: PSLPS16/4541  Respondent: 15486977 / P Jefferson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4686  Respondent: 15487009 / Yvonne Peyton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4687  Respondent: 15487041 / S Comfy  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4689  Respondent: 15487105 / Keith Pew  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4694</th>
<th>Respondent: 15487137 / P Doherty</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the GreenBelt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4697</th>
<th>Respondent: 15487169 / Emily Wigfall</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the GreenBelt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4698</th>
<th>Respondent: 15487201 / Samantha Dale</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the GreenBelt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4559</th>
<th>Respondent: 15487233 / Lindsey Schravetta</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the GreenBelt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSLPS16/4701</td>
<td>15487265 / Helen Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSLPS16/4702</td>
<td>15487329 / Adam Sadler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSLPS16/4703</td>
<td>15487361 / Roger Dean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSLPS16/4705</td>
<td>15487425 / B Pryor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4706  Respondent: 15487457 / Aidan Beckett  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4707  Respondent: 15487489 / Luke Draper  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4567  Respondent: 15487521 / A Malcmer  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/4709  
**Respondent:** 15487553 / Nicholas Eager  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4710  
**Respondent:** 15487585 / Debbie Eggleton  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4711  
**Respondent:** 15487649 / Paul Adams  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4636  
**Respondent:** 15488065 / Heather Beaver  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4721  
Respondent: 15495297 / Daniel Perkin  
Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4734  
Respondent: 15495361 / Therese Elizabeth Hill  
Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5183  
Respondent: 15495393 / M Rendell  
Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the GreenBelt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5185  
Respondent: 15495457 / R Laroche  
Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the GreenBelt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/5187  Respondent: 15495681 / Pippa Mathews  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the GreenBelt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5188  Respondent: 15495777 / Michael Lowe  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the GreenBelt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4759  Respondent: 15495809 / Katie Critchlow  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5190  Respondent: 15495841 / Nicholas Fox  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the GreenBelt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/5191</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15495905 / Emma Marshall</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the GreenBelt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/4765</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15495937 / C Aruncel</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/4774</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15495969 / Olivia Doyle</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/5192</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15496001 / Ryan Hookind</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally an inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5196</th>
<th>Respondent: 15496257 / Charlotte Philipps</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the GreenBelt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5197</th>
<th>Respondent: 15496289 / W.A. McGregor</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the GreenBelt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5171</th>
<th>Respondent: 15496353 / P.J. McGregor</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the GreenBelt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment ID: PSLPS16/5173  Respondent: 15496385 / Paul Bold  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the GreenBelt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5172  Respondent: 15496481 / R Frampton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the GreenBelt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5174  Respondent: 15496545 / Gillian Frampton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the GreenBelt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4810  Respondent: 15496609 / Dena Parker  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the GreenBelt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the GreenBelt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the GreenBelt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4836  Respondent: 15497377 / David Freeborough  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4842  Respondent: 15497441 / Holly Hicks  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4960  Respondent: 15497505 / Jyoti Nanda  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.
The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through lurpham which is grid-locked every

Burpham's sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants .

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England's requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel,which is only an "aspiration" in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4907</th>
<th>Respondent: 15497953 / Rebecca Dougherty</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4914</th>
<th>Respondent: 15498049 / Natasha Howard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4931</th>
<th>Respondent: 15498241 / Faye Church</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4940</th>
<th>Respondent: 15498369 / Kris Steadman</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4963</td>
<td>Respondent: 15498785 / Catherine Elingworth</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5000</th>
<th>Respondent: 15499873 / Pan Illingworth</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5015</th>
<th>Respondent: 15500065 / Rachael Illingworth</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5028</th>
<th>Respondent: 15500513 / Alex Illingworth</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/5037  **Respondent:** 15500801 / Morgan Schooling  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/5047  **Respondent:** 15501217 / Luke Sarti  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/5066  **Respondent:** 15501313 / Matthew Dougherty  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/5073  **Respondent:** 15502049 / Paul Marshall  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data: 2010 -2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- TiH1ebams Lane to Pois1110Uth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents 2015
• 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street - A 247 closed in both directions 
• 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham 
• 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and sec is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until the A3 reaches the A320 Stock Road.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham's sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the local plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.
The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,DDD. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England's requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an "aspiration" in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/5298  **Respondent:** 15502241 / Richard Atkinson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**I OBJECT** to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data: 2010 -2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tythebarns Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents 2015
Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and sec is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until the A3 reaches the A320 Stock Road.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham's sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the local plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.
If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,DDD. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England's requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an "aspiration" in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5096  Respondent: 15502305 / S. Gibbs  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5104  Respondent: 15502433 / Jill Murphy  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the proposals for Gosden Hill because they breach the Green Belt, put West Clandon in danger of being joined up to Guildford and will generate excessive extra traffic for Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5121  Respondent: 15502977 / Alexandra Morton  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5157</th>
<th>Respondent: 15503105 / Beml Evans</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5163</th>
<th>Respondent: 15503169 / A Palitchell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5176</th>
<th>Respondent: 15503361 / James Pasfield</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5199</th>
<th>Respondent: 15503585 / B Powell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5211</td>
<td>Respondent: 15503617 / Stephen Roy</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5217</th>
<th>Respondent: 15503649 / N Ord</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5223</th>
<th>Respondent: 15503777 / Elya Koudou</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment ID: PSLPS16/5233  Respondent: 15503809 / M Pratt  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO site A25 Gosden Hill Farm – this represents massive overdevelopment of 2000 homes in the Green Belt and will merge Clandon and Burpham creating urban sprawl

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5248  Respondent: 15504001 / Margaret Banks  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.
If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/5290  **Respondent:** 15504897 / Frank Shepherd  **Agent:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document:</th>
<th>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the draft local plan.

The A3 problems have been with us for many years. how can planning for an enormous increase in housing be done before infrastructure ie A3 and local roads requirements is in place, or at least planned.

The best solution for the A3 would be a tunnel. The obvious place for the tunnel entrance would be Gosden Hill Farm which precludes building 2000 houses. A smaller number might be accommodated.

If Gosden Hill were to be built as planned then the effect on Burpham (where I live) would be dreadful. Thousands more vehicles would come through Burpham both to enter and leave the development. Access should be both Southbound and Northbound to the A3 and a four-way junction would be essential.

The calculation for the number of houses required is suspect. The figures used are not released - why?

As a member of Burpham Community Association I support their objections to the plans. They are more expert than I.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/5302  **Respondent:** 15504993 / Harry Eke  **Agent:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document:</th>
<th>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• I OBJECT to the proposed development of Gosden Hill Farm (Policy A25) and its inevitable impact on the roads around Send. Despite assurances of an additional railway station, commuters will utilise the opportunity to
leave the A3 at the existing Burnt Common roundabout and travel on the faster Woking to Waterloo line, rather than use the slower Guildford line.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5521</th>
<th>Respondent: 15505761 / James McMarken</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5350</th>
<th>Respondent: 15505793 / Edward Goddard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5361</th>
<th>Respondent: 15505921 / Andrew Forest</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5520</td>
<td>Respondent: 15506017 / Steven Ponsford</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5367</th>
<th>Respondent: 15506049 / Mandy Shoesmith</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5522</th>
<th>Respondent: 15506081 / Dale Miller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5525</th>
<th>Respondent: 15506113 / Sheila Taylor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5378</td>
<td>Respondent: 15506177 / Jean Calas-Hathaway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5528</th>
<th>Respondent: 15506209 / Rosemary Richardson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5529</th>
<th>Respondent: 15506305 / Pamela Sadler</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5531</th>
<th>Respondent: 15506401 / Alicia Robinson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally an inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4551  Respondent: 15506401 / Alicia Robinson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5532  Respondent: 15506433 / Geoffrey Robinson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally an inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5384  Respondent: 15506465 / Lisa Garner  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25 
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5390  Respondent: 15506625 / Ian Toft  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25 
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5403  Respondent: 15506657 / Teresa Laroche  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25 
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5431  Respondent: 15506881 / Chloe Brown  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25 
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5502  Respondent: 15507457 / Andre Rose  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5508  Respondent: 15507489 / K Garner  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5533  Respondent: 15507585 / Patrick Laroche  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5538</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 15507617 / Ewan Collens</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5545</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 15507649 / Nick Turner</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to policy A25 Gosden Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosden Hill is located entirely within the green belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5636</td>
<td>Respondent: 15507713 / Yvonne Connolly</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5634</th>
<th>Respondent: 15507745 / M Grainger</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5632</th>
<th>Respondent: 15507809 / M Smith</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally a inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5631</th>
<th>Respondent: 15507841 / Mark Fenner</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally an inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5630</th>
<th>Respondent: 15507873 / Andy Tupper</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally an inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5629</th>
<th>Respondent: 15507905 / Hannah Lewis</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally an inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5628</th>
<th>Respondent: 15508001 / Lisa Barwick</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally an inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5627</th>
<th>Respondent: 15508033 / D Worship</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5626  Respondent: 15508065 / Christina Worship  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt which will cause coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5603  Respondent: 15508385 / Susan Woodman  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The loss of Green Belt land, more specifically the proposed Green Belt development at Gosden Hill. I oppose unjustified Green Belt development. Allowing Green Belt development to pay for transport schemes will simply generate yet more traffic from more homes, fuelling congestion.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4248  Respondent: 15508385 / Susan Woodman  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I don’t believe you have addressed the objections raised previously. I also believe the Draft Local Plan is still unsound and unsustainable.

2,000 new homes on Gosden Hill will be a huge mistake. The infrastructure simply is not there and Burpham cannot take any more traffic. The roads are already blocked every day, the pollution is in excess of permissible levels and will only get worse. The thousands of vehicles that will be generated will mostly travel through Burpham and is dangerous for pedestrians and for all our health. You recently allowed the Aldi application who have since then broken every planning restriction originally passed and now the many large lorries are numerous, dangerous and heavily polluting.
You cannot take our Green Belt away. Housing in Gosden Hill is in our Green Belt and with such plans you are eventually going to join Guildford up with Woking and/or Clandon. You need to safeguard our countryside from encroachment, from merging into other towns and preserve the character of Burpham.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6961  Respondent: 15570817 / Tom Edelsten  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital  Send Marsh Road
Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.
Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4365  Respondent: 15570817 / Tom Edelsten  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6963  Respondent: 15571201 / Zoe Dudgeon  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 – 2014 from Crashmap data
- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015
- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016
- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 June 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.
The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Gosden Hill Farm:

This massive proposed development will have a huge impact on Burpham, the proposal is to effectively double the size of Burpham. This is a major assault on a village area on the outskirts of town. Burpham is already congested particularly at peak times, adding to this 2000 houses, a 1000 car park and ride, 2 schools and perhaps a station will add thousands more car movements to an already congested road network. The increase in solution is unacceptable.

Gosden Hill is in the Green Belt, the topography of the hill means it is a very visible site when driving on the A3. Development of these green fields will spread the urban sprawl in a very visible manor significantly up the A3.

A large portion of the traffic from this massive site will head towards Guildford via the roads through Burpham, this is already congested and will simply not cope with the increase, moreover the pollution of near stationary cars will blight the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5718  Respondent: 15571617 / Bruce Garbutt  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- **I object** to the Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan
- The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to
  - It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon,
- It gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space, and
- It hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to
  - No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the
  - Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.
- The development as presented could generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush
- The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely
- No plans are shown for the necessary sewage, fresh water and power Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications.
- The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for What has changed?
- The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it
- The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and
• Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years in the meantime, given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5805  Respondent: 15571617 / Bruce Garbutt  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I object to Policy A25 Gosden Hill Farm.

1. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating the parish of West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce, defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and the houses along The Street in West Clandon (owned by the same developer as Gosden Hill Farm) will come under enormous pressure. Since the 2014 Draft Plan was withdrawn, the area under consideration has been enlarged in the direction of West Clandon.

1. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a slip road provision at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

1. The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

1. The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A-road. In places it is under 5m wide and too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement (see also below).

1. I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon-a road which is already under traffic stress (see also below) and which Surrey County Council say cannot be improved.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5735  Respondent: 15571937 / S Bennell  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcots Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from
encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4701  **Respondent:** 15571937 / S Bennell  **Agent:**
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5750  Respondent: 15572897 / Stephen Johnson  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Following review of material published on the GBC New Local Plan website and my attendance at a recent meeting of the Burpham Community Association held as part of the consultation process, I wish to register my strong opposition to the plan as it is currently framed.

I find the overall plan long on ‘aspiration’ but woefully short on practical details: however, as a resident of Burpham I intend to concentrate on one issue, specifically the plan to build 2,000 houses on the Gosden Hill Farm site. This development impacts on all policies (except for numbers 5, 9 and 11) detailed in the Evidence Base but, again, I will concentrate on one aspect, namely transport infrastructure, because all the other policies are predicated on this single item.

According to the most recent ONS Neighbourhood Statistics, Burpham (as covered by Guildford 008A, 008B and 011A Lower Layer Super Output Areas) contains 2,425 dwellings. The proposed development on Gosden Hill represents an 82.5% increase in the number of dwellings. Quite apart from the destruction of green-belt land and village character of
the neighbourhood, notwithstanding the massively increased pressure on provision of adequate water, sewage and power services, the impact on road transport will be unbearable.

Currently the road network serving Burpham (primarily London Road, New Inn Lane and Clay Lane) is stretched beyond capacity on a daily basis, a situation that is exacerbated if there are problems on the A3, which, unhappily, occur regularly. The proposed construction of new A3 southbound on and off slip roads and minor alterations to London Road will only have the effect of funnelling more traffic through Burpham. At present there is often gridlock at the roundabouts connecting London Road to New Inn Lane and Clay Lane: a potential increase of 3-4,000 vehicles passing through the area as a result of the Gosden Hill development would make this a permanent feature. It is true that a proportion of this extra traffic would join the A3 southbound but the only effect of this would be to stretch the congestion further north: even now at peak times, the southbound queue tails back from the beginning of the elevated section to the Burpham off-slip.

There can, and must, be no more major housing developments anywhere in Burpham (or Merrow or West Clandon for that matter) until the road transport problem is solved: prior to any consideration of the Burpham local road network the problems presented by the A3 have to be resolved. Whether the answer is a tunnel, widening, double-deck or a by-pass to the by-pass, until the solution is in place – that is built and operational – there has to be a moratorium on large-scale housing development in Burpham and its neighbouring wards.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5785  Respondent: 15574337 / Jacqueline Redknap  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost. How is this going to be funded?

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. How is this going to be addressed?

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5814</th>
<th>Respondent: 15575009 / Tony Redknap</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.
The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost. How is this going to be funded?

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. How is this going to be addressed?

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development. The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3. Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
As a resident of Burpham I have particular interest in the plan to build 2,000 houses on the Gosden Hill Farm site. This development impacts on all policies (except for numbers 5, 9 and 11) detailed in the Evidence Base. There is a worrying lack of detail about confirmed improvements to the infrastructure needed to support this one housing development (let alone the other sites in the Plan) but the lack of consideration and detail to the transport infrastructure is of most concern. Guildford definitely needs more schools, it needs more housing, but it also needs an inspirational approach to traffic management through the town and the A3. The Plan fails in its Duty to provide a sound solution to the traffic problems that will follow from another 2,000 houses and associated cars in the Clandon/Burpham area.

According to the most recent ONS Neighbourhood Statistics, Burpham (as covered by Guildford 008A, 008B and 011A Lower Layer Super Output Areas) contains 2,425 dwellings. The proposed development on Gosden Hill represents an 82.5% increase in the number of dwellings, which is an astonishing increase, and one which will inevitably have an impact on a wide environment. It is the duty of GBC to manage that impact effectively and appropriately. Quite apart from the destruction of green-belt land and village character of the neighbourhood, and, notwithstanding the massively increased pressure on provision of adequate water, sewage and power services, the impact on road transport will be unbearable.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6959</th>
<th>Respondent: 15575457 / Pauline Johnson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the GBC plan as it is currently framed as I do not believe the strategy and sites as a whole to be sound. As a resident of Burpham I have particular interest in the plan to build 2,000 houses on the Gosden Hill Farm site. This development impacts on all policies (except for numbers 5, 9 and 11) detailed in the Evidence Base. There is a worrying lack of detail about confirmed improvements to the infrastructure needed to support this one housing development (let alone the other sites in the Plan) but the lack of consideration and detail to the transport infrastructure is of most concern. Although Guildford needs more schools and housing, it first urgently needs an effective approach to traffic management through the town and the A3. The Plan fails in its Duty to provide a sound solution to the traffic problems that will follow from another 2,000 houses and associated cars in the Clandon/Burpham area.

According to the most recent ONS Neighbourhood Statistics, Burpham contains 2,425 dwellings. The proposed development on Gosden Hill represents an 82.5% increase in the number of dwellings! This is a massive increase and will inevitably have an impact on a wide environment. It is the duty of GBC to manage that impact effectively and appropriately. Quite apart from the destruction of green-belt land and village character of the neighbourhood, and, notwithstanding the massively increased pressure on provision of adequate water, sewage and power services, the impact on road transport will be unbearable.

Currently the road network serving Burpham (primarily London Road, New Inn Lane and Clay Lane) is stretched beyond capacity on a daily basis and is made far worse if there are problems on the A3, which happens regularly. The proposed construction of new A3 southbound on and off slip roads and minor alterations to London Road will only have the effect of funnelling even more traffic through Burpham. At present there is often gridlock at the roundabouts connecting London Road to New Inn Lane and Clay Lane: a potential increase of 3000+ vehicles passing through the area as a result of the Gosden Hill development would exacerbate this problem and make it fairly consistent throughout the day, not just at rush hours. Although some of this extra traffic would join the A3 southbound, this would only stretch the congestion further north when even now at peak times, the southbound queue tails back from the beginning of the elevated section to the Burpham off-slip. It also to be noted that such an increase in traffic doesn’t just affect Clandon, Merrow and Burpham, it would have a corresponding effect on town centre traffic flow, congestion and parking.
Before embarking on further housing developments in Guilford, it is vital that the existing road and traffic problems are addressed first, which would also include addressing the congestion and safety issues of the A3. Those who agree to the plan as it currently stands would be making a mistake. It would be their names connected with consigning Guildford to a future of increasing traffic congestion, regular gridlock, and increased pollution. The lack of practical detail regarding important infrastructures, such as roads, traffic flow and increased sewerage and water provision, indicates that the plan has not been positively prepared, and as such is not justified and consequently cannot be effective; it therefore does not meet GBC’s own overall aspirations and thereby fails the Duty to Cooperate.

Until the GBC Local Plan has concrete solutions to the current traffic problems, experienced on the main arterial roads into Guildford, and effectively addresses the increased pressure on the road infrastructure placed by new housing estates and new villages, any large-scale housing developments are inevitably in jeopardy. The new GBC Local Plan has not scored positively on its own 7-point On-line Questionnaire for the proposed sites, and that is the basis of my strong objection the Plan in its current form.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6306  Respondent: 15577665 / Grant Angus  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I urge you to consider the views of local residents and rethink the inclusion of these sites in the local plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5962  Respondent: 15579489 / Ben Palmer  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Gosden Hill developement being in the Local Plan The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow,
winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

Again the infrastructure required does not seem to have been addressed in the plan.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants. The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5970  Respondent: 15579713 / Barbara Hackman  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to object very strongly to the proposed development at Gosden Hill Farm in the Draft Local Plan. I believe insufficient consideration has been given to transport issues.

- Without a 4 way junction onto the A3 to the north of Burpham all traffic from the new site wishing to travel north will have to use London Road and Clay Lane resulting in a large increase of local traffic.
- Improvements to the A3 are not scheduled in the draft plan until some years after the development of housing on the proposed site.
- Traffic from the proposed site wishing to travel to Guildford will cause additional pressure on the narrow London Road and especially the London Road/New Inn Lane roundabout inundating Burpham with additional traffic. Burpham’s road network is currently under considerable pressure at certain times of the day.
- There are still problems regarding surface water drainage in parts of Burpham and a large development will cause further problems.
- Such a large development on the edges of Burpham, West Clandon and Merrow is out of keeping with the village atmosphere of the three parishes.

For these reasons I very strongly object to such a large development at Gosden Hill Farm.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6623  Respondent: 15579713 / Barbara Hackman  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to object very strongly to the inclusion of the development of Gosden Hill Farm in the Draft Local Plan. I believe insufficient consideration is being given to the infrastructure required for such a development.
1. a) Without a 4 way junction onto the A3 to the north of Burpham all traffic from the new site wishing to travel north will have to use London Road and Clay Lane resulting in a large increase of local traffic.
2. b) Improvements to the A3 are not scheduled in the draft plan until some years after the development of housing on the proposed site.
3. c) Traffic from the proposed site wishing to travel to Guildford will cause additional pressure on the narrow London Road and especially the London Road/New Inn Lane roundabout inundating Burpham with additional traffic. Burpham’s road network is currently under considerable pressure at certain times of the day.
4. d) Such a large development on the edges of Burpham, West Clandon and Merrow is out of keeping with the village atmosphere of the three parishes.

For these reasons I very strongly object to such a large development at Gosden Hill Farm.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5975  Respondent: 15579809 / Julie Pilkington  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Decision needed on a tunnel before Gosden Hill can be embarked for development – Surely there needs to be a plan in place to combat the severe traffic congestion already affecting the wider area of Guildford before any extra housing plans can be approved

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5979  Respondent: 15580065 / Deniz Kucukreisoglu  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am also opposed to the development proposals for Burnt Common, Gosden Hill farm and Burpham. As those areas will also incur irreparable damage to their fabric and sustainable wellbeing.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6011  Respondent: 15581665 / Laura Daboo  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.
The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 – 2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays

Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 June 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see above and below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.
The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained. To allow this would be plain irresponsible.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 June 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see above and below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from
encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained. To allow this would be plain irresponsible.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5992</th>
<th>Respondent: 15581793 / Douglas Spinks</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed developments in North East Guildford and particularly at Gosden Hill Farm (Policy A25) are unacceptable. The plan fails to demonstrate how these developments can be accommodated within the current infrastructure envelope. There are no detailed proposals to show how improvements to the highways network can satisfactorily cope with the traffic likely to be generated by these new developments. In addition, the existing highway network in this part of Guildford is unable to cope with current traffic flows at peak times.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the absence of detailed infrastructure proposals, the Council has failed to demonstrate that policy A25 is genuinely capable of meeting the Borough’s development needs in the plan period.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is unreasonable to make proposals conditional upon as yet unknown infrastructure solutions and expect residents to speculate on whether or not those solutions will be acceptable to them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6009</th>
<th>Respondent: 15582113 / Esme Spinks</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development proposals at Gosden Hill Farm (Policy A25) are unacceptable. The plan does not demonstrate how this development can be accommodated within the current infrastructure. There is an absence of detailed infrastructure proposals. There is reference to a new southbound on slip road to the A3 but this would lead to significant traffic congestion for Burpham and there is no indication of any detailed infrastructure proposals associated with this. Furthermore, all the necessary infrastructure should be undertaken in advance of any development proposals but it is not reasonable to make proposals conditional upon as yet unknown infrastructure proposals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7377</th>
<th>Respondent: 15582337 / Peter Hill</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to site A25 Gosden Hill Farm. This is a massive over development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. Reference should be made to the evidence of numerous accidents for recent years. Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing. There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development. The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.
The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010–2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
• Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
• Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
• Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

• 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays

  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

• 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
• 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
• 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.
Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6110  Respondent: 15584161 / Alexandra Elson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.
Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.
Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the
Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon,
gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass
the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with
paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from
encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All
requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus
shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history
going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before
the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day
during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow,
winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send
and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two
schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham
which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous
cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a
dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it
wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be
uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over
West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around
14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s
requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in
the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow
for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.
Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6144  Respondent: 15584961 / Helen Meredith  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY A25- Gosden Hill Farm

I object to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm. The Green Belt serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford and Gosden Hill Farm currently provides a green buffer and gives Burpham a defined green boundary. The Plan fails to provide any evidence that any exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement. The scale of development proposed at Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon being four times the size of the existing village. The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

I strongly object to the proposal for a 4 way junction at Burnt Common. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km. This junction would have the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow roads through West Clandon, Send and Ripley. The additional traffic will also greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6154  Respondent: 15585249 / Joe Eke  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• I OBJECT to the proposed development of Gosden Hill Farm (Policy A25) and its inevitable impact on the roads around Send. Despite assurances of an additional railway station, commuters will utilise the opportunity to leave the A3 at the existing Burnt Common roundabout and travel on the faster Woking to Waterloo line, rather than use the slower Guildford line.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6163  Respondent: 15585313 / Kim Styles  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO – Gosden Hill Farm A25 overdevelopment in the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6172  Respondent: 15585345 / Wanita Styles  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO – THE HUGE OVERDEVELOPMENT OF 2200 HOMES AT GOSDEN HILL FARM a25

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6176  Respondent: 15585409 / Vanessa Styles  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO – Gosden Hill Farm Site A25. Overdevelopment of 2000 homes in the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6188  Respondent: 15585601 / Sophie Corstin  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm
I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 – 2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.
The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I am writing to protest most strongly against the proposed Gosden Hill Farm developments which, if they go ahead will have a devastating effect on the area including Burpham Village where I am a long–time resident. It seems quite incomprehensible that precious Green Belt land, which should be sacrosanct and preserved for posterity could be swept aside and built over in this way, against the wishes of the local people, just to turn a millionaire landowner into, presumably, a multi–billionaire, the justification being to relieve pressure on the urban areas. People living in the urban areas surely need the Green Belt on their doorstep as their amenity and quality environment.

I am sure the many flaws in this grossly overambitious plan have been pointed out to you by people better qualified than myself. Anyone can see the problems which would arise from traffic management, the dangers of flooding [already a hazard along the drain running from Merrow Lane to the River Wey] [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered contrary to the Council’s duty under the Equalities Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation against persons with a protected characteristic; and to foster good relations between persons with a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it] and the need for additional services of all kinds. My motivation for writing to you is the preservation of the precious fields and woods which will be lost for ever if this development goes ahead, which God forbid.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Turning towards my own area in Burpham, I am astonished that the proposed Gosden Hill development has been so badly thought out in terms of the effects it will have on the existing Burpham area, particularly that of increased road traffic. The effects will ‘knock on’ to the wider area of Guildford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6265  **Respondent:** 15587361 / Aileen Creegan  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land; all are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.
The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
POLICY A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 – 2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.
No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.
Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6360  **Respondent:** 15589761 / Paula Foster  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I am objecting to the proposed development of Gosden Hill Farm. I believe the the plans to be unsound as there does not seem to be enough access to the A3 planned ie, north and south slip roads.

The resulting excess traffic will have to travel through Burpham (a residential area) which is already struggling with a huge amount of cars trying to get to the A3.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6368  **Respondent:** 15589889 / Keith Macdonald  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve: it provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land, all requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery and schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour onto the A3 which is already stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the
narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day, and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could do virtually whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime, given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and roads like the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill with which health and safety issues are associated.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6402  **Respondent:** 15590273 / Eunja Madge  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development...
proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents
- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays

Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 June 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.
The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools. Currently, a two-way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime, given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6395  Respondent: 15590305 / Mike Riddiford  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

No exceptional circumstances to allow Unnecessary Development have been shown by Borough Council to warrant the 2000 house and traveller sites being built on Gosden Hill Farm. Guildford’s report on housing figures is UNSOUND.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.
If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7668  **Respondent:** 15590881 / David Godden  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object very strongly to the unsustainable Draft Local Plan 2016, which is clearly based on flawed data.

I support the Guildford Residents’ Association (GRA) response to the Draft Local Plan 2016 and am opposed to Guildford expanding by a quarter. No exceptional circumstances to allow unnecessary development have been shown by Borough Council to warrant the 2,000 house and traveller sites being built on Gosden Hill Farm.

The GRA state the reasons why the policy of maintaining the green spaces and not merging Burpham into a double sized sprawl meeting the boundary of West Clandon has not been met.

Finally, GBC did not properly account for how the report’s figures were arrived at and allowed too short a period of consultation making the Draft Local plan unaccountable and is therefore unsound.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6436  **Respondent:** 15591041 / Dan Gordon  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

No exceptional circumstances to allow unnecessary development have been shown by Borough Council to warrant the 2,000 house and traveller sites being built on Gosden Hill Farm.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
4. I object to the hiding of development by “deferment” (A25, A26, A43)
This version of the Plan has concealed some development planned to take place by “deferring” it beyond the period covered by the Local Plan. This is designed to have 2 effects:
i) to hide the number of houses actually being built (A24, A25, A26 – total of 1100 deferred, but still being built!), and
ii) give an excuse for building houses on another site (A43 – 400/650 houses proposed) when they are not needed.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

I also object to the inclusion of a strategic employment site at Gosden Hill Farm. Employment sites should be concentrated on previously developed land in more sustainable locations with good transport links where the infrastructure can support development. Warehousing, distribution and industrial premises cause considerable commercial traffic, noise, pollution and general disruption. They are not good neighbours for schools and 2000 houses. Many of the jobs will be taken by people outside the area leading to additional congestion in Burpham and on the A3.

Significant improvements to the road infrastructure are like to be many years away even if they ever happen. The draft plan, however, commits to building massive housing estates in the countryside before any of these road improvements are in place. This is inappropriate and will lead to massive traffic disruption during the construction phase and will add permanently to an already congested network.

Road infrastructure represents a major constraint that should have been applied to the housing target at a much earlier stage in the plan process and not left as an unresolved difficulty in the draft plan.

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites such as that identified at Gosden Hill (A25) will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health and can result in early death.

This development will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

• Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
• Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
• Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
• Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

• 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays

Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.
2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 June 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to the surrounding villages. It would have four times the amount of housing as West Clandon plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight this historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants. The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.
A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6584  **Respondent:** 15595649 / Margaret Hunt  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

POLICY A26

Sir, I wish to object to the local plan on the grounds that it is unsound, for the following reasons.

1. in the development at Gosden Hill, it appears that the building of the houses etc. will begin before the new roads are put in. This will lead to increased traffic through Burpham, already snarled up at peak times.

2. the plan for the park and ride seem a good idea, but, while the traffic from the north will enter easily, when the customers return they will have to come through Burpham to access the Clay lane slip road, again causing holdups and increased pollution from idling cars. An access road from the park and ride, and the new houses, to the north bound carriageway would seem a sensible idea, channelling the traffic away from Burpham bottleneck.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6670  **Respondent:** 15599297 / Janice Mcouat  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the massive overdevelopment of the green belt at Gosden Hill farm and also any in-setting of our villages from the Green Belt. There are no infrastructures to support these developments, Ripley itself has no secondary school and all local schools in the vicinity are at breaking point.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.
No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.
No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.
No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital  Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.
No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.
Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6725</th>
<th>Respondent: 15601825 / Claire Billard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosden Hill (policy A25) The scale of the development proposal and its potential impact on the A3 and other local roads is a major concern. The provision of a rail link may help to partially alleviate the problem, but the number of houses proposed is far higher than is suitable for the location and unless the development is invisible from the A3 then it will detrimentally affect the appearance of the borough as a predominantly rural area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6729</th>
<th>Respondent: 15601857 / Martin Billard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gosden Hill (policy A25) The scale of the development proposal and its potential impact on the A3 and other local roads is a major concern. The provision of a rail link may help to partially alleviate the problem, but the number of houses proposed is far higher than is suitable for the location and unless the development is invisible from the A3 then it will detrimentally affect the appearance of the borough as a predominantly rural area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6739</th>
<th>Respondent: 15602113 / Janet Woodward</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT TO site A25 Gosden Hill Farm – massive overdevelopment of 2000 homes in the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.
I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.
Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford. The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt. The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement. Note the following accident data: 2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

2016
- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below). The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF. The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond. Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below). The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF. The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond. Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before
the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools. Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is gridlocked every day. Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost. There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development. The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London. The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants. The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km. Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3. Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6806  Respondent: 15604449 / Annabel Curling  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:
2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital  Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.
There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6836  Respondent: 15607553 / Penelope Gillmore  Agent: ( )

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.
The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data
Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
Bennett Way to Highcots Lane - 15 incidents
Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015
21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016
15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow,
winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an "aspiration" in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6851  Respondent: 15608289 / Olivia Marshall  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.
The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays

Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.
The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6857</th>
<th>Respondent: 15608545 / Madeleine Ringshaw</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip road to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.
Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which raise health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4464  Respondent: 15608801 / Beth Fuller  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green. Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6931  Respondent: 15610785 / Liz Vinall  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.
The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.
The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highways England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6937  Respondent: 15610785 / Liz Vinall  Agent: PSLPS16/6937  Respondent: 15610785 / Liz Vinall  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space, and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip road at Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the Doomsday book and beyond. It would be hugely detrimental to the rural feel of West Clandon and the agricultural outlook from the boundaries of the village.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will increase traffic on the A3, which already has stationary traffic every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.
Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have significant health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7444  Respondent: 15610913 / Gillian Hague  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. 14. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space, and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip road at Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the Doomsday book and beyond. It would be hugely detrimental to the rural feel of West Clandon and the agricultural outlook from the boundaries of the village.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will increase traffic on the A3, which already has stationary traffic every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.
The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

**If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.**

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have significant health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6965  **Respondent:** 15612481 / Gillian Culmer  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:
2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays

  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.
There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6995  **Respondent:** 15615745 / Nicholas Thompson  **Agent:**  
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25  
**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.
The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010–2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarns Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near Shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7035  Respondent: 15618305 / Lawrence Claridge  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.
Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.
Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7036  Respondent: 15618337 / Matthew Pitt  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.
The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data
- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015
- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016
- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7041  Respondent: 15618561 / Howard Klein  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Specifically in respect of Gosden Hill - The population of Burpham is c5,000, including a number of new housing areas; but adding a further 2,000 homes will destroy the sense of the environment.

On a personal note - Merrow Lane north of the railway bridge (to the corner near the A3) is an important part of our countryside, which will be destroyed – for cyclists and walkers alike.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7057</th>
<th>Respondent: 15618945 / Gabriel Street</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. We object to the proposed junction in front of our property. Clandon road is already a very busy road and people driving on or off it from Highcotts or from our cottages find it quite challenging. The present junction to the A3 has proved to be hazardous with accidents occurring frequently.

2. We object to 2200 houses being built between Clandon and Burpham on the Gosden Hill site. The road through Clandon village, the Street, is very narrow without pavements both sides. People walking with children to the primary school have to cross the road several times. Driving from the station and the pubs is dangerous as the views of the road are severely restricted. More traffic would increase the dangers.

3. If Guildford council want to build all this extra housing then the villages of Clandon, Ripley and Send should be by-passed as they cannot cope with an increase in traffic.

We have been away and unable to object until now. We feel that you should have informed those who would be most affected by these major changes in close proximity to their houses, people like us. Why haven't you?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7074</th>
<th>Respondent: 15624577 / Alec Marshall</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
• Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

• 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays

Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

• 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
• 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
• 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.
The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7088</th>
<th>Respondent: 15626881 / Mariah Mills</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosden Hill Farm:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This massive proposed development will have a huge impact on Burpham, the proposal is to effectively double the size of Burpham. This is a major assault on a village area on the outskirts of town. Burpham is already congested particularly at peak times, adding to this 2000 houses, a 1000 car park and ride, 2 schools and perhaps a station will add thousands more car movements to an already congested road network. The increase in solution is unacceptable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosden Hill is in the Green Belt, the topography of the hill means it is a very visible site when driving on the A3. Development of these green fields will spread the urban sprawl in a very visible manor significantly up the A3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A large portion of the traffic from this massive site will head towards Guildford via the roads through Burpham, this is already congested and will simply not cope with the increase, moreover the pollution of near stationary cars will blight the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/7106 | Respondent: 15627329 / Loraine Crates | Agent: |
**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I object to site A25 Gosden Hill Farm which is a massive development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt. This will merge Clandon and Burpham and substantially increase traffic on all surrounding roads.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID: PSLPS16/7129  Respondent: 15629025 / Surrey County Council (Sir or madam)  Agent:**

**Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25**

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Site Allocation A25

**Gosden Hill Farm Page 178/9**

Under “Requirements,” a bullet point should be included under the heading, “Infrastructure” requiring the provision for extended/new bus services to provide seamless connectivity between the site, the existing eastern suburbs of Guildford, and the town centre (as well as any through journeys that can be provided in the future to the western fringes of the town), unless this will be adequately met by the Sustainable Movement Corridor.

In addition, it may be appropriate to refer to the need to provide permeability for pedestrians and cyclists into and from the development, especially from the existing urban fabric of Guildford.

To ensure consistency throughout the document, change wording relating to primary schools to accord with the format of Policy A26 Blackwell Farm and Policy A35 Wisley.

Under “Allocation”, within the penultimate bullet point, we would like to see the wording “potentially as a through school” deleted as the organisation of the school will be decided at a later stage.

Under “Requirements,” Infrastructure, we consider that the secondary school site provision should be dealt with under a separate bullet point. Reference should be made under the new bullet point to the dual use of the playing fields which are essential for the school. It should be stated that ownership of the playing fields will be made over to the school and the dual use will be managed by the school according to an appropriate legal deed of covenant.

It would be useful for us to know where the playing fields are to be located.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID: PSLPS16/7140  Respondent: 15629377 / The Woodland Trust (Jack Taylor)  Agent:**

**Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25**

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference number</th>
<th>Name of site</th>
<th>Nearest town</th>
<th>Development description</th>
<th>Woodland adjacent or within?</th>
<th>Type of woodland affected (e.g. ASNW, PAWS, secondary) &amp; grid reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A25</td>
<td>Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow Lane, Guildford</td>
<td>Guildford</td>
<td>Mixed use development</td>
<td>Within Adjacent</td>
<td>Unnamed ASNW at Grid Ref TQ026522 Unnamed ASNW at Grid Ref TQ033533 Unnamed ASNW at Grid Ref TQ031532 Frithy’s wood PAWS at Grid Ref TQ031530</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7248  **Respondent:** 15636481 / Peta Lawrence  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Loss of green belt. The development at Gosden Hill farm will effectively join Burpham village with the nearby villages of Clandon and Send. There is no reason to ‘inset’ the proposed areas from the green belt apart from existing land ownership. Planning should not be seen to unfairly benefit private development companies to the detriment of existing communities.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7373  **Respondent:** 15644577 / John Cotton  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT TO site A25 Gosden Hill - massive overdevelopment of 2000 homes in the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7468  **Respondent:** 15649345 / Matthew Sarti  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of A25 Gosden Hill Farm development within the local plan. This development is within the Green Belt and no exceptional circumstances are evidenced. It also reportedly relies on the new
Guildford East station to prove sustainability. Network Rail have not commissioned or agreed to developing or servicing this. The site will have a significant impact on the A3, which the Council notes to be a potential blocker to achieving the local plan in its entirety. It will also have a devastating affect on Burpham, which already struggles with too much traffic and congestion.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7505  Respondent: 15649889 / Alan Hughes  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Any development at "Gosden Hill Farm" needs a 4 way interchange on the A3 road, close to Burpham's slip road, this is planned from 2021 but is out of kilter with an aspirational "Guildford Tunnel" which if done is likely to be in this area, will not be delivered until 2023 -2027; so there will be a period of intense traffic overload in Burpham.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7529  Respondent: 15650369 / Stephanie Dean  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A25 Gosden Hill Farm.

1. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating the parish of West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce, defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and the houses along The Street in West Clandon (owned by the same developer as Gosden Hill Farm) will come under enormous pressure. Since the 2014 Draft Plan was withdrawn, the area under consideration has been enlarged in the direction of West Clandon.

1. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a slip road provision at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

1. The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

1. The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A-road. In places it is under 5m wide and too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement (see also below).
1. **I object** most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon—a road which is already under traffic stress (see also below) and which Surrey County Council say cannot be improved.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7539</th>
<th>Respondent: 15652833 / Don Babington</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan. The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.
The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7602  Respondent: 15657057 / Frances Turner  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY A25 GOSDEN HILL

I object to policy A25 Gosden Hill

There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

Gosden Hill is located entirely within the green belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.

The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow,
winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7612  Respondent: 15657121 / Robert Wheeler  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site A25 Gosden Hill Farm which is a massive over development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7729  Respondent: 15666625 / Anna Ruddy  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.
The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham's sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England's requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an "aspiration" in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7813  Respondent: 15674273 / Savills for Thames Water (Katherine Jones)  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )  

Thames Water would welcome the opportunity to work closely with the Local Planning Authority and the developer to better understand and effectively plan for the water treatment infrastructure needs required to serve this development. It is
important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: Water Treatment Works upgrades can take 18 months to 3 years to design and build.

We have concerns regarding Wastewater Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.

The proposed 2000 dwellings and other development exceed the capacity trigger levels for available network. Developer funded impact study required to understand implications of development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8010  Respondent: 15698753 / Anna Calvert  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site A25 Gosden Hill Farm. This is a large scale overdevelopment of the area

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8039  Respondent: 15704737 / Sarah Smith  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- Specifically I object to the Gosden Hill development. An appeal was made by the developers to overturn a previous GBC refusal for this plan in the 1980’s. This went to appeal and GBC fought and won and the refusal was upheld. Why on earth is this now in the local plan. Nothing has changed since then. The site is still inappropriate, the infrastructure is woefully inadequate and putting 2000 homes in this area would severely impact an already very busy area. There is little or no detailed information and the suggestion is so unripe it should not even be a suggested site in the plan. This land is greenbelt and as such should be left as the buffer to town encroachment of the countryside, as was it’s purpose. If this was passed - which it should NOT be - there should be a 4-way junction from the A3 and NO exit through Merrow and Burpham. This would mean that traffic would be sensibly routed around the development.

Additionally if there is to be a new station at Merrow, the station itself should be on the Gosden Hill side of the development. The lane to the current Merrow depot is too small and narrow to take the traffic. The junction is too small
and dangerous, with the railway bridge also causing issues. The 90 degree turn also causes accidents and near misses regularly. Should the station not be sited on the Gosden Hill side of the track, the parking and all access to the station must be via a footbridge from that side. The Merrow Lane route to the depot is far too small.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8047  Respondent: 15705281 / Anna-Maria Mitchell  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed Gosden Hill site at Clandon/Burpham for 2,200 homes as the local schools, medical facilities and utilities are already at capacity and would not be able to handle the vast increase in the local population that would come with the development of this site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8062  Respondent: 15706785 / Yasmin Nabe  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed development at Slyfield which omits to show improved road systems and would lead to traffic gridlock.

The full consequences of the proposed local plan are enormous and are only now emerging. For example, even if all the proposed highway improvements in the Plan were built, congestion would not improve. We would just have a lot more people stuck in traffic and traffic would get a very great deal worse to start with. In our area, Stoke next Guildford changes we would be likely to experience include:

• the expansion of Guildford along the A3. Development of 2000 homes on Gosden Hill, by Burpham, is a particular local concern
• more traffic from the major development sites coming in on the Stoke Intersection and London Roads
• roads near us, such as Stoke Rd, and York Road, being even busier due to other more central routes being closed to through traffic, pedestrianised or used for development
• pressure for high density development eroding character in our area

It is a matter of choice by our Council that Guildford would expand on this scale. Many residents were prepared to support our Council in the need for some sensitive, measured expansion. However the scale of what is proposed is far from this.

Other Councils are applying “constraints” to their overall housing number. This is allowed. By contrast, Guildford is proposing to release so much land for development that we could end up being asked to meet housing need for neighbouring towns. We find ourselves in the bizarre situation where it is suggested we sacrifice our countryside in order to protect countryside around Woking.
Please do not let this local plan go ahead in its present form.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8078  Respondent: 15710433 / Simon Hester  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to A25, this would dramatically and detrimentally effect the village setting and be a foolish and irresponsible development adjacent to a motorway.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4572  Respondent: 15711265 / Jonathan Dowling  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43 at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Policy A25 – My Objections

1) Gosden Hill development of 1700 houses. Reference to a potential link road from the development to the A247. The clear implication is for an access from the development to the A247 with enormous traffic implications for the A247.

2) South bound off- and on- slip roads to service the development and replace the existing off- slip road to Burpham. The only North bound access to the A3 will be via the existing slip road off Clay Lane. (See later, Burnt Common).

3) A 4-entry form secondary school, a primary school, a retail centre and a park and ride for up to 700 cars.

4) When developed, the new employment site at the north side of Gosden Hill Farm (site allocation A25) will be treated as an Office and Research & Development Strategic Employment Site (7000sq.m). This could mean several hundred employees.

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data
- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015
- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016
- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/8226  **Respondent:** 15725409 / Nicholas Ward  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.
The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7755  **Respondent:** 15746081 / Highways England (Patrick Blake)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

[Highways England made a formal representation on 18 July 2016. See the first attachment for this representation including comments on this element of the consultation documents and/or associated evidence base.]

Highways England made further comments on 5 October 2016 following a clarification meeting with Guildford Borough Council. See the second attachment for this letter.]

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: Highways England letter 18 July 2016 - Representation to consultation.pdf (7.7 MB)
- Highways England letter 5 October 2016 - Further comments following clarification meeting with GBC.pdf (1.2 MB)

POLICY A25: GOSDEN HILL

APPENDIX C INFRASTRUCTURE SCHEDULE

Highways England notes the proposed reduction in the number of dwellings and employment space to be delivered during the plan period. The removal of the definition of the size of the Park and Ride site from Policy A25 is also noted.

We support the proposed changes to the policy. We particularly note the transport package to facilitate growth at the site which includes having regard to the forthcoming Sustainable Movement Corridor Supplementary Planning Document which alongside other measures has the potential to reduce impacts on the A3.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/5435  Respondent: 15746081 / Highways England (Patrick Blake)  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes. Deferral of the target number of homes by 300, to be built after the plan period, is effectively just a smoke and mirrors exercise. This housing is still being allocated. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development...
proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Ripley through to Guildford. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below). The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4553  **Respondent:** 15922337 / Andrew Malcher  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 Gosden Hill as being totally inappropriate and unsustainable development of 2000 homes in the Green Belt, which will see coalescence and urban sprawl from Burpham to West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3219  **Respondent:** 16206593 / Bloor Homes (Rebecca Fenn-Tripp)  **Agent:** Turley (Donna Palmer)

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

2.46 We strongly support the proposed allocation of land at Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow Lane for a residential mixed use development. It is considered the site represents an appropriate location for such an allocation and that the proposed mix of uses will create a vibrant, mixed community. The sustainability of the site will be further enhanced by the range of infrastructure requirements proposed to support the allocation including the proposed park and ride facility, improved junction with the A3 and contributions towards delivering Guildford East (Merrow) railway station. These credentials were recognised through the assessment of the site in the Sustainability Appraisal (June 2016) and are not detrimentally altered by the proposed amendments to the policies as confirmed in the 2017 Sustainability Appraisal.

2.47 Our client’s control the northern most parcels of land that form part of the proposed allocation site. These parcels can deliver part of the proposed residential development or other supporting uses as part of the wider draft allocation site. Bloor Homes will work with the promoters of the wider allocation to ensure the delivery of the proposed allocation. There are no known technical constraints which would prevent development of this part of the site coming forward subject to appropriate design and mitigation as could be secured through any future grant of planning permission.
2.48 In addition to the land parcels contained within the proposed allocation, Bloor Homes also control wider land to the east of these parcels currently comprised of Nutbourne Farm. It is considered that these parcels would form a logical extension to the proposed allocation which would assist in increasing the capacity of the proposed allocation site. This is of particular importance in light of the concerns identified above in respect of the Council’s proposed housing requirement and supply. These matters are discussed in detail in Section Three. However allocating additional land to the north of the Gosden Farm would assist in meeting the needs of the Housing Market Area in a sensible and logical way. Whilst it is acknowledged that the additional land is currently Green Belt, its release will have no greater impact on the landscape than the draft allocation at Gosden Farm. The additional parcels being referred to are currently used for car boot sales as well as agricultural purposes and therefore already support a ‘use’ as opposed to being truly green field. Indeed the site could be argued as being brownfield which weighs in favour of its release from the Green Belt.

3. Nuthbourne Farm – Land to the east of Gosden Hill Farm

3.1 As discussed in Section Two, in addition to the land parcels contained within the proposed allocation, Bloor Homes also control wider land to the east of these parcels currently comprised of Nutbourne Farm (see plan at Appendix One). It is considered that these parcels would form a logical extension to the proposed allocation which would assist in increasing the capacity of the proposed allocation site. This is of particular importance in light of the concerns identified in Section Two in respect of the Council’s proposed housing requirement and supply, including the need to help meet the needs of adjoining authorities.

3.2 The suitability of land to the east of Guildford as a location for strategic growth has been recognised by the Council through the allocation of the Gosden Hill Farm site and is supported by the Council’s detailed evidence base.

3.3 It is considered that the land controlled by Bloor Homes, at Nuthbourne Farm would have the capacity to deliver circa 300-400 homes with an associated extension to the SANG currently proposed to support the Gosden Hill Farm allocation. This development would represent an entirely logical extension to the current draft allocation and would assist the Council in meeting their housing needs.

3.4 The additional parcels being referred to are currently used for car boot sales as well as agricultural purposes and therefore already support a ‘use’ as opposed to being truly green field. Indeed the site could be argued as being brownfield which weighs in favour of its release from the Green Belt.

3.5 The Council has previously assessed the site against the Green Belt purposes as part of parcel C3, as shown on the plan below. [See page 1 of Appendices for plan]

3.6 The table below sets out the Council’s assessment of the wider parcel against the Green Belt purposes and our commentary on these in respect of the site itself. [See page 2 of Appendices for table]

3.7 The site is located within Flood Zone One and as such is an appropriate location for residential development subject to appropriate drainage design. There are no known drainage or flooding issues and a planning application would be supported by a detailed Flood Risk Assessment.

3.8 An area of ancient woodland is located on the site’s eastern boundary. This would be retained and protected as appropriate as part of the development of any proposals for the site.

3.9 EDP, on behalf of Bloor Homes, has undertaken a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal of the site. This has concluded that the designated sites, habitats and species potentially present within and around the site do not pose an ‘in principle’ constraint to development of the site. There are no statutorily or non-statutorily protected nature conservation interests within the proposed development site or off-site that would be materially affected by the proposals, subject to the appropriate provision of SANG either on or off-site.

3.10 The habitats present on site are generally of low (site level) intrinsic ecological value, such that development of the site would have a minimal effect on local biodiversity. Some habitats considered of local level value are present, as well as higher value off site semi-natural ancient woodland, but subject to appropriate masterplan design, in accordance with the design principles outlined above, adverse effects upon these habitats can be readily avoided, mitigated or compensated for a net gain to biodiversity achieved.
3.11 A Preliminary Landscape Appraisal has also been prepared by EDP in respect of the proposed development of the wider Bloor Homes landholding. The Appraisal concludes that overall this is a landscape denuded of much of its historic landscape fabric. Topographically, and in terms of its landscape fabric, there are few material constraints to either site layout or capacity. The findings of EDP’s test of the site against the main purposes of Green Belt has shown that, whilst the site does contribute to the openness of the Green Belt in part, it is not considered to be a highly functioning part of the Green Belt as it is a partially enclosed site detached from the wider landscape character, with some urbanising elements, which is only seen by few receptors in relatively close proximity to it. In this regard, even in the absence of the Gosden Hill Farm allocation, the site could be released from the Green Belt without adversely affecting the Green Belt’s function in the wider context.

3.12 From a landscape perspective, it is EDP’s opinion that there are no ‘in principle’ constraints with regard to future built development of the site. However, in the interests of good masterplanning, attention should be given to the higher ground within the site which can be seen in views from elevated locations with the local context. In addition, the key landscape features (hedgerows and trees) should be retained and enhanced to reduce the site’s geometric structure and mitigate landscape and visual effects, helping to integrate the site into its context.

3.13 CgMS has undertaken an Archaeological Desk Based Assessment which confirms that there are no World Heritage Sites, Registered Historic Parks and Gardens, Historic Battlefield or Wreck sites within a 1km radius of the site. The site is not located in an ‘Area of High Archaeological Potential’ as defined by Guildford Borough Council or a ‘County Site of Archaeological Importance’ as defined by Surrey County Council. Overall the Assessment concludes that if further archaeological assessment is required by the Local Planning Authority, this could be undertaken after the grant of planning consent, secured by an appropriately worded condition. As such there are no archaeological or heritage based constraints associated with the allocation of this land.

3.14 A report has been undertaken by Phil Jones Associates in respect of potential access arrangements and the overall sustainability of the site. A copy of the report is attached at Appendix Two. In summary, the site could be served by its own independent access off the A3 and link to the draft allocation at Gosden Farm in the interests of creating a sustainable and legible form of development.

3.15 The Report also outlines the existing and proposed public transport and highway improvements that could be undertaken to support the draft and extended allocation, as set out in the draft policy. However, it is noteworthy that the draft policy outlines an aspiration to deliver a new link road between the A3/A3100 Burpham junction and the B2215. It is questionable whether this link road is indeed necessary to facilitate the proposed allocation at Gosden Farm, however any land physically required to deliver any improvement should be safeguarded to facilitate its delivery. On this basis my client’s additional land interests should form part of the wider allocation to ensure that the site can be delivered in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF.

3.16 Any planning application would be supported by a Travel Assessment and Travel Plan which would provide further information in this context. There are no overriding highway constraints to the delivery of the site in a logical and sustainable manner.

3.17 In conclusion it is considered that there are no in principle constraints to development of the site. The wider landholdings of Bloor Homes represent a logical opportunity to extend the existing Gosden Hill Farm site for an additional 300 - 400 dwellings and associated SANG. It is considered that the conclusions of the Sustainability Appraisal in respect of the Gosden Hill Farm allocation would equally be applicable to the Nutbourne Farm extension land and would enhance the credentials of the overall allocation. The increased quantum of development would help in addressing the concerns raised regarding the Council’s proposed housing target and the means of delivering this.

4. Conclusion

4.1 These representations have been prepared by Turley on behalf of Bloor Homes Southern in respect of the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2017). The consultation is targeted to the proposed changes to the Plan since the 2016 consultation and the revised evidence base documents.

4.2 Our client has important land interests in the Local Plan area, in particular at Nutbourne Farm – land to the east of Gosden Hill Farm, Guildford. As such this response focuses on issues which particularly affect the site.
4.3 Each of our responses relates to a particular policy or paragraph and this report is structured accordingly. In summary our submissions are:

- **Policy A25** – We strongly support the proposed allocation of the site Gosden Hill Farm site and the recognition of its sustainability to accommodate a large scale extension to the existing settlement.

- **Nutbourne Farm** – we consider the site presents an opportunity to extend the proposed allocation at Gosden Hill Farm and further enhance its sustainability credentials and meet the needs of the Borough, and the needs of adjoining authorities.

[See attachment for Appendices]

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attached documents:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>170717_02896 Land at Gosden Hill Farm Guildford Site Access Study Part3.pdf (4.3 MB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170717_02896 Land at Gosden Hill Farm Guildford Site Access Study Part2.pdf (3.9 MB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170717_02896 Land at Gosden Hill Farm Guildford Site Access Study Part1.pdf (4.7 MB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turley.pdf (7.9 MB)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment ID: pslp172/1292  Respondent: 16209409 / Natural England (Amy Steel)  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to raise 2 points that I feel most strongly about to the amended Guildford local Plan Consultation 2017

Although a revised number of new homes have now been identified for Guildford, numbers are based on assumptions and calculations have not made publicly available. These numbers have not been obtained through any kind of independent report and so are inherently inaccurate.
With regard specifically to the proposed development (A 25) at Gosden Hill Fam, Guildford, using existing roadways and traffic junctions is unsustainable. The nearby roads are often congested and at a standstill on a very regular basis.

In the Guildford Borough Transport Strategy 2017 document, several references are made as to ‘Aspirations to the A3 Guildford Tunnel’. Unfortunately this document is not included in the Guildford Local Plan. Surely the Guildford Borough Transport Strategy and Local Plan should be considered concurrently? The tunnel proposal should be thoroughly investigated, planned and included in the Local Plan as this would save a great deal of money in the long term. Otherwise Guildford will find itself either unable to build this tunnel and Guildford could become a ‘no go’ area for many due to the congestion getting into, out of, or through Guildford. Alternatively Guildford will find itself in a similar situation to Sheffield and the HS2 train route where people living in newly constructed properties face having their homes demolished to make way for infrastructure.

I also support Burpham Community Associations representation to you.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1076  Respondent: 17240193 / Anita Aptel  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Gosden Hill development being in the Local Plan The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.
There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Please register my objection to the planned building works around Burpham.

Gosden Park is Green Belt and the whole point is to STOP urban sprawl and keep England green.!!

The huge increase in vehicles and Nitrogen Dioxide is a very real safety concern that KILLS!!!

Having lived in Guildford and now in Burpham, traffic has always been busy and the A3 traffic jams are a regular thing, an additional 2000 homes, 8 gypsy sites, retail sites and office areas will only add to this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1) Gosden Hill development of 1700 houses. Reference to a potential link road from the development to the A247. The clear implication is for an access from the development to the A247 with enormous traffic implications for the A247.

2) South bound off- and on- slip roads to service the development and replace the existing off- slip road to Burpham. The only North bound access to the A3 will be via the existing slip road off Clay Lane. (See later, Burnt Common).

3) A 4-entry form secondary school, a primary school, a retail centre and a park and ride for up to 700 cars.

4) When developed, the new employment site at the north side of Gosden Hill Farm (site allocation A25) will be treated as an Office and Research & Development Strategic Employment Site (7000sq.m). This could mean several hundred employees.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2034  Respondent: 17295265 / Brian McGee  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Gosden Hill development of 1700 houses. Reference to a potential link road from the development to the A247. The clear implication is for an access from the development to the A247 with enormous traffic implications for the A247.

South bound off- and on- slip roads to service the development and replace the existing off- slip road to Burpham. The only North bound access to the A3 will be via the existing slip road off Clay Lane. (See later, Burnt Common).

A 4-entry form secondary school, a primary school, a retail centre and a park and ride for up to 700 cars.

When developed, the new employment site at the north side of Gosden Hill Farm (site allocation A25) will be treated as an Office and Research & Development Strategic Employment Site (7000sq.m). This could mean several hundred employees.

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much. Overall housing need is for single and two person households at affordable rents with good public transport access, not commuter estates.

2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.

4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.

5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

- Gosden Hill development of 1700 houses. Reference to a potential link road from the development to the A247. The clear implication is for an access from the development to the A247 with enormous traffic implications for the A247.

- South bound off- and on-slip roads to service the development and replace the existing off-slip road to Burpham. The only North bound access to the A3 will be via the existing slip road off Clay Lane. (See later, Burnt Common).

- A 4-entry form secondary school, a primary school, a retail centre and a park and ride for up to 700 cars.

- When developed, the new employment site at the north side of Gosden Hill Farm (site allocation A25) will be treated as an Office and Research & Development Strategic Employment Site (7000sq.m). This could mean several hundred employees.

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.

2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.

4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.

5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2066  Respondent: 17296417 / Simon Wilcockson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Gosden Hill development of 1700 houses. Reference to a potential link road from the development to the A247. The clear implication is for an access from the development to the A247 with enormous traffic implications for the A247.

South bound off- and on- slip roads to service the development and replace the existing off- slip road to Burpham. The only North bound access to the A3 will be via the existing slip road off Clay Lane. (See later, Burnt Common).

A 4-entry form secondary school, a primary school, a retail centre and a park and ride for up to 700 cars.

When developed, the new employment site at the north side of Gosden Hill Farm (site allocation A25) will be treated as an Office and Research & Development Strategic Employment Site (7000sq.m). This could mean several hundred employees.

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2162  Respondent: 17301089 / Amanda Alexander  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I also object to the 1700 homes at Gosden Hill, site A25. Again this huge amount of homes, with no facilities is disproportionate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2217  Respondent: 17301473 / Lynda Turner  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A25 Gosden Hill Farm

I have objected before to the 2,000 houses proposed for this site. The Plan to reduce the number of houses to 1,700 would not materially reduce the huge, detrimental impact that this development would have on the A3 and other local roads.

I therefore strongly object to this ill thought out proposal which would generate additional traffic along the narrow A247 Clandon Road and Send Barn Lane/Send Road leading to Woking.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2273  Respondent: 17302753 / Mark & Lucy Ingram  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

strongly object to the following proposals set out in the document:

1) Gosden Hill development of 1700 houses

2) Southbound on- and off- slip roads to service the development and replace the existing off slip road to Burpham.
3) A 4-entry form secondary school, a primary school, a retail centre and a park and ride for up to 700 cars

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2312  Respondent: 17303553 / Anita Fitchie  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burrntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road

Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.
I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.
Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2326  **Respondent:** 17303713 / Andrew Fitchie  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
- 28 April 2016 A3 West Clandon London bound between A247 Tythebarns Lane (Burntcommon and M25J10 (Wisley Interchange) congestion on A3 to A3100 Clay Lane Burpham
- 30 6 2016 Motorcyclists with injuries airlifted to hospital Send Marsh Road
Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size. Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.

If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.
Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2559  Respondent: 17323265 / Simon Owen  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A25 with proposals for Gosden Hill Farm.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure.

It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The Plan does not put forward any evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt.

The development will overburden the local road network and increase congestion on the A3 and A247 through the centre of West Clandon. This is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement.

Note the following accident data:

2010 –2014 from Crashmap data

- Clandon Cross Roads Area to Bulls Head - 17 incidents
- Bulls Heads Head to Bennett Way - 8 incidents
- Bennett Way to Highcotts Lane - 15 incidents
- Tithebarn Lane to Portsmouth Road Birch Close - 8 incidents

2015

- 21 Oct 2015 – A247 near shell garage - Three vehicles collided causing delays
  Surrey Fire and Rescue deployed.

2016

- 15 April 2016 12 year old boy injured in The Street – A247 closed in both directions
Attempts have been made over many years to reduce traffic, traffic speeds and accident risks through West Clandon, however little has been achieved as the road cannot be widened and SCC is reluctant to impose further speed limits as congestion is already very high.

I object most strongly to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The land in Gosden Hill does exactly what the Greenbelt was designed to achieve. It provides a green buffer between the Guildford Urban Area and West Clandon, gives Burpham a defined green boundary and breathing space and it hides Guildford town from visitors until they pass the off-slip to Burpham.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore it does not comply with paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. It stops the sprawl of Guildford town, assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assists in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. All of these are requirements of the NPPF.

The scale of Gosden Hill is out of proportion to West Clandon. It would have four times the amount of housing plus shops, offices/factories, GP surgery, schools. Development on this scale would blight a historic village with a history going back to the doomsday book and beyond.

Gosden Hill is the most obvious location for the north end of an A3 tunnel. It has rising ground and is situated just before the urban area. If it is built on, it will be very difficult to construct a tunnel.

The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will pour on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon, a road where large lorries mount the pavement virtually every day and through Send and Ripley which are also severely constrained.

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

Currently, a two way junction at the site would require vehicles wanting to go north on the A3 to go through Burpham which is grid-locked every day.

Burpham’s sewers are at capacity. Sewage would have to be pumped to Slyfield for processing, a project of enormous cost.

There is inadequate fresh water in Guildford and current supplies could not meet the needs of a development of this size.

Electricity supply is also inadequate and would require a big infrastructure development.

The railway station was rejected by Guildford Borough Council in 1984 because it feared Gosden Hill would become a dormitory estate for London.

The wording of the Local Plan with regard to Gosden Hill is so loose that the developer could virtually do whatever it wants.

The remaining agricultural land between Gosden Hill and West Clandon is so small that it is highly likely to be uneconomic and therefore a prime candidate for further development which would roll the Guildford Urban Area over West Clandon towards East Clandon and Wisley.
If the Strategic Sites are developed, the north of Guildford will deliver 36%, 5,036 houses towards the total of around 14,000. The infrastructures of the existing villages and the A3 will be overwhelmed by the scale of development.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

Development of the A3 at best will not start until after 2020 and the building of a tunnel, which is only an “aspiration” in the Local Plan, is likely to be many years after. In the meantime given that developers build houses to provide cash-flow for infrastructure, Gosden Hill will have a crippling effect on villages like West Clandon and the A3.

Gosden Hill already has surface water problems. Merrow Stream crosses the site. No hydrological survey has been carried out to assess the implications. Electricity pylons run through the centre of Gosden Hill which have health and safety issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I am writing to object to the plans Policy A25: Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow Lane, Guildford.

Under the proposed changes, the Infrastructure (1) has changed from a ‘new’ junction to an ‘improved’ junction. ‘Improved’ is incredibly subjective and will be difficult to prove. Traffic is already jammed at rush hours - Burpham is notorious for ‘crawling’ traffic after 4.30pm. The addition of traffic from 1,700 homes without a specific, designated junction and only the requisite that the current junction is ‘improved’ is simply not enough to ease the flow. These are small residential roads, not designed to withstand the heavy flow of traffic coming in from the A3.

Glendale Drive and Winterhill Way will become a cut through road for many people if a separate off-slip for the new Gosden Hill estate is not built. The roads simply cannot take any more traffic and it is quite frankly dangerous with people speeding through and lots of children walking to and from the schools through this area.

Our neighbours and ourselves have already complained several times to the Council regarding the quality of the road and how potholes are appearing, large cracks which now shake the surrounding houses. The Council simply states it does not have the money to fix the roads. Adding 1,700 homes worth of traffic on top of the problem is not the solution. As I pointed out to a local Councillor, the Council may not have the money to fix the roads but nor do we, as home owners, have the money to fix our houses from the shaking-damage and supplement the Council’s negligence in maintaining the roads. A group of neighbours are seriously considering legal action against the Council for their continued refusal to solve the problem.

I would also like to point out that the A3100 is not a ‘corridor’ within Burpham. It’s a residential road, already under immense strain at peak hours. We are also aware that the southbound Burpham slip road is already over its weight allowance to support the number of cars using it during peak hours.

I would also like to raise an objection to the significant bus network to serve the site. I’ve already mentioned the road quality within Burpham, specifically Glendale Drive (Winterhill Way was recently resurfaced). I would like to challenge the interaction with the Arriva bus network 36 & 37, which speed down Glendale Drive, contributing to the cracks and shaking of the houses and are hardly utilized. I would like to know what impact the new bus network will have on the existing one? Would we need both? Would the new bus network need to also drive through Glendale Drive?

I find statement (11) contradictory of the ‘allocation’ where a secondary school is mentioned and yet (11) says it will be determined at the time;

Surely this can already be determined? Places at the local secondary schools are already at a premium and with the addition of 1,700 homes it is clear a lot of children will miss out – including those of us already living here. Another secondary school needs to be built to service these homes so as not to impact the education of the younger children already here whose parents have moved to the catchment area in good faith.

I’d also like to query statement (22) where an Employment centre HQ is being proposed. I am unclear how this fits in with Guildford’s mandate of building new homes? This is a job centre? Not residential homes. I feel like this is a ‘sweetener’ to the Council to allow the planning to go through, providing them with an Employment Centre HQ, but it doesn’t fit at all with the surrounding area which is residential. How does an office in the middle of a residential area work?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  Objection_letter_regarding_A25_Gosden_Hill1.docx (64 KB)
The documents imply that there is a reduction to 1,700 new homes (from the earlier figure of 2,000. But it now appears this is misleading and that the lower figure is still a minimum. In any event, this scale of new homes planned is, in my opinion, so large as to inevitably damage the whole infrastructure of the area.

Infrastructure: The proposed changes to the access to the A3, together with other recent and proposed road system changes will, in my opinion, have such a large negative impact on Burpham as to inevitably cause major traffic disruptions and should be entirely reconsidered.

The proposed development will generate a daily movement of thousands of vehicles the vast majority of which will pass through Burpham. This Plan represents yet another ill-conceived planning proposal, with insufficient thought given to the infrastructure needed.

The last few decades have seen two major housing estates, a considerable number of smaller garden grabbing developments, one super store and, recently, one very inappropriately sited supermarket. Both because of the volume and reduced speed of traffic, these changes regularly lead to severe air pollution which damages the quality of our lives in Burpham. The current Plan represents a major worsening in an already unacceptable traffic and pollution situation.

Access to the development:

Access/egress to and from the proposed development is shown from one roundabout, serving traffic from the A3 and the A3100 which, in my opinion, is unacceptable owing to the risk of grid-lock. The whole matter of access (as well as scale) needs to be reconsidered.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3440  
Respondent: 17413025 / Sally Novell  
Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A25 change re Gosden Hill Farm. Even though housing numbers at this site seem to have been revised slightly downward to 1700 from 2000, the wording in Policy A25 now states ‘Approximately 2,000 homes of which a minimum of 1,700 homes will be delivered within the plan period’. This seems to be suggesting a change which in reality may not exist, and is misleading.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3584  
Respondent: 17417985 / John Dumbleton  
Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The NPPF is clear that Local Plans should only meet objectively assessed needs if any adverse impacts of doing so do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole, or specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted. GBC have not put forward any
meaningful justification of the benefits from the development of Gosden Hill Farm outweighing the harm to the Green Belt. On that basis alone, Policy A25 should not be part of this draft of the Local Plan.

In fact, it is impossible to make any really meaningful comment on many aspects of this Policy since there is so little detail in the Plan on internal design, infrastructure and transport connections for the Gosden Hill Farm site other than to note it introduces continuing unacceptable uncertainty and particularly since there is now so little apparent commitment from the Highways Authorities to provide the necessary road infrastructure.

Reliance on the developer to fund much of the infrastructure including the SMC, A3, Park and Ride and Merrow Station seems unrealistic and the obligations should certainly be better spelt out well before the planning application stage.

Improvement to the A3 is critically important to any development of Gosden Hill Farm. As mentioned above, it is self-evident that the pressure on local roads in Burpham is already intense in peak periods and these roads are clearly not suited to carrying large volumes of traffic. Under the Plan, congestion is very likely to be worse than it is now. Consequently, it should be a fundamental requirement that the Gosden Hill Farm development should only go ahead with a four-way junction connection to the A3 and preferably with a tunnel under the A3.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3694  Respondent: 17424801 / Gregory Webb  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• Policy A25 - Gosden Hill Farm

I have previously objected to the previous intention to construct 2,000 homes on this site and consider that the new Plan’s proposal to reduce the number of dwellings to 1,700 homes would not materially reduce the very detrimental impact that the scheme would have upon the A3 and other local roads. I object to this revised proposal on the grounds that the number of houses proposed for this area is still far too high and, unless the development is totally concealed from the A3, it would detrimentally affect the appearance of the borough as a predominantly rural area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3943  Respondent: 17434817 / Jenny Wicks  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A25

I object to this changed policy

The Green Belt at this point prevents the sprawl of urban Guildford into the countryside. Development here will be highly visible from the A3 and, together with Forner Wisley Airfield, Garlicks Arch and Burnt Common will form a built up corridor from the London conurbation southwards beyond Guildford.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4008  Respondent: 17443745 / Robert Siaens  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like to vehemently object to the proposed plans for Gosden Hill Farm as they currently stand. While Guildford is certainly in need of new homes to help meet national house-building objectives, the proposed plan to build 1,700 – 2,000 new homes on this site, in my mind raises enormous concerns, with most of the new traffic passing through Bursham

Bursham already suffers considerably from traffic congestion,

• particularly when there is an accident on the A3, which happens all too frequently and clogs up the roads through Bursham and further down with traffic trying to get through Guildford and
• at the London Road/New Inn Lane/Bursham Lane roundabout with traffic queuing to enter the – too small – Aldi supermarket car park, clogging up all adjacent roads.

Unless an efficient new junction with 4-way access to and from the A3 is included, all traffic from any development heading south onto the A3 will have to go towards town to access it, further clogging up Guildford’s already dire traffic problems. Guildford’s traffic problems HAVE TO BE addressed first and foremost to alleviate this awful problem, which is currently reducing the quality of life in this otherwise wonderful town. And all these problems are contributing to a worsening pollution problem in Bursham and Guildford, to which the proposed new housing on Gosden Hill farm will only contribute.

The A3 HAS TO BE sorted out, improvements carried out and, more than anything else, a tunnel planned to eliminate the bottleneck at the Cathedral junction during rush hours or when an accident happens. I consider this to be vital to the traffic flow and consequent wellbeing of our traffic congested town!

I understand that we need new and affordable housing, but for the reasons I have indicated, I object to the Plan as it now stands.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4029  Respondent: 17445153 / Gillian Brierle  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There is an inference by GBC that the number of houses in this plan has been reduced but in fact the 1700 homes is only the suggested minimum, not the maximum so there is no change of policy here.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: pslp172/5208  Respondent: 17445153 / Gillian Brierle  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object that the developer will be unable to "provide the eastern route section of the Sustainable Movement Corridor on the site and make a necessary and proportionate contribution to delivering the eastern route section on the Local Road Network, both having regard to the Sustainable Movement Corridor Supplementary Planning Document."

The A3100 London Road is the road which will become an SMC carrying both north and south bound traffic; cars, buses, HGVs, motorbikes and bicycles lanes. This is not possible in sustainable in a 2-lane road.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4057  Respondent: 17446625 / Education and Skills Funding Agency (Douglas McNab)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. The ESFA supports the clarification of requirements regarding secondary school provision in policies A25 and A26; and the clarification of requirements for developer contributions towards education provision in policy A29.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4401  Respondent: 17452673 / Philip and Maureen Blunden  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4819  **Respondent:** 17484449 / Thames Water Utilities Ltd (Sir or Madam)  **Agent:** Savills (Richard Hill)

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Water Response</th>
<th>Waste Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42324</td>
<td>A25 - Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow Lane Guildford</td>
<td>The water treatment capacity in this area may be unable to support the demand anticipated from this development. Minor infrastructure upgrades may be required to ensure sufficient treatment capacity is available to serve this development. Thames Water would welcome the opportunity to work closely with the Local Planning Authority and the developer to better understand and effectively plan for the water treatment infrastructure needs required to serve this development. It is important not to underestimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: Water Treatment Works upgrades can take 18 months to 3 years to design and build</td>
<td>Infrastructure at the wastewater treatment works in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Significant infrastructure upgrades are likely to be required to ensure sufficient treatment capacity is available to serve this development. Thames Water would welcome the opportunity to work closely with the Local Planning Authority and the developer to better understand and effectively plan for the sewage treatment infrastructure needs required to serve this development. It is important not to underestimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: Sewage Treatment Works upgrades can take 18 months to 3 years to design and build. Implementing new technologies and the construction of a major treatment works extension or new treatment works could take up to ten years. The wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Strategic drainage infrastructure is likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a wastewater network capacity constraint the developer should liaise with Thames Water and provide a detailed drainage strategy with the planning application, informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.

5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4368  Respondent: 17490241 / David Harland  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.

2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.

4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.

5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4377  Respondent: 17490369 / Miriam Edelsten  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight onto the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4395  Respondent: 17490561 / Derek Gillmore  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.

4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.

5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4398</th>
<th>Respondent: 17490593 / Emily Edwards</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) | 1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.  
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.  
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,  
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity  
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.  
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.  
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below). |
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4416</th>
<th>Respondent: 17490753 / David Marshall</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4420</th>
<th>Respondent: 17490785 / Mary Ball</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4436  Respondent: 17490881 / David Smylie  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4479  Respondent: 17491297 / Sonja Freebody  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? (>), is Sound? (>), is Legally Compliant? (>)

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4484  Respondent: 17491329 / Maura Dearden  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? (>), is Sound? (>), is Legally Compliant? (>)

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4494</th>
<th>Respondent: 17491489 / Margaret Perkins</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4530</th>
<th>Respondent: 17491745 / Colin Marshall</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4539  Respondent: 17492833 / Helen Marshall  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4548  Respondent: 17492897 / James Robinson  Agent:
1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick’s Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
C.i. Policy 25 Gosden Hill – My Objections

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4639  Respondent:  17494689 / Clare Chambers  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England's requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and
   ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for
   building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore,
   Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban
   Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If
   this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green. Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon
   at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon
   development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in
   conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send
   through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads.
   The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is
   stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of
   cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way
   junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial
   vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build
   two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway
   England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4737  Respondent: 17496129 / Neil Rampe  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.

2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt.

4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity.

5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

C.i Policy 25 Gosden Hill – My Objections
I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.

There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore, Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,

The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send through to Guildford.

The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads. The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.

I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).

The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for
building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore,
Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban
Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If
this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon
at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon
development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in
conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send
through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads.
The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is
stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of
cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way
junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial
vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build
two schools.
9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway
England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/5069  Respondent: 17507713 / T. A Trusler  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A25

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A25 Gosden Hill for the development of 1700 homes which is still far too much.
2. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and
goes ignores constraints.
3. Gosden Hill is located entirely within the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for
building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF. Furthermore,
Gosden Hill performs all five functions of green belt,
4. The site has no provision for foul or surface water sewerage and adjoining sewerage is at capacity
5. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from the edge of urban
Guildford. Development here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. If
this development proceeds I believe the narrow strip of Green Belt remaining between Guildford and Clandon
at this point will be too narrow and will come under further pressure. It will represent an undesirable ribbon
development along the A3. It will be highly visible from the A3 when approaching Guildford and will, in
conjunction with A43a at Garlick's Arch give the appearance of almost continuous development from Send
through to Guildford.
6. The development of this site cannot be sustainable and will cause massive congestion onto surrounding roads.
The development will generate in the region of 6,000 vehicles which will exit straight on to the A3 which is
stationary every day during rush hours. The linking of the A3100, B2215 and A247 would channel thousands of
cars through the narrow, winding road through West Clandon.
7. I object to the proposal for a link road to bring traffic from the Gosden Hill development to the proposed 4 way
junction at Burnt Common. This has the potential to generate large volumes of traffic (including commercial
vehicles) on the A247 through Send and West Clandon - a road which is already under traffic stress (see below).
8. The volume of traffic will greatly increase air pollution which is particularly critical given the proposal to build two schools.

9. A new on-slip at Burpham would only be 1.8km from the on-slip at Burnt Common which is against Highway England’s requirement of 2km.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
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